



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1997

No. 28

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hold us, O gracious God, when we falter; lift us, O God, when we fall; strengthen us when we are weak and keep us ever in Your grace. With gratefulness we pray for guidance along life's way and with humility we pray for reconciliation in all that divides and separates us from each other and from Your will for us. Show us Your bountiful gifts that justice will be our focus and mercy Your everlasting blessing. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a Joint Resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution waiving certain provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 relating to the appointment of the United States Trade Representative.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 75, nays 293, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—75

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Nussle
Allen	Harman	Oliver
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Pallone
Becerra	Hinojosa	Payne
Berman	Hookey	Pelosi
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Reyes
Brown (OH)	John	Rothman
Clyburn	Johnson (WI)	Sandlin
DeGette	Kaptur	Slaughter
DeLauro	Kennedy (MA)	Smith, Adam
Dellums	Kennedy (RI)	Stark
Deutsch	Kennelly	Tauscher
Dicks	Lantos	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Lipinski	Thompson
Eshoo	Maloney (CT)	Tierney
Evans	Martinez	Torres
Farr	Matsui	Towns
Fazio	McDermott	Waters
Filner	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Ford	Millender	Wexler
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Weygand
Frost	Miller (CA)	Yates
Gejdenson	Mink	
Gekas	Neal	

NAYS—293

Aderholt	Buyer	Cummings
Armey	Callahan	Cunningham
Bachus	Calvert	Danner
Baker	Campbell	Davis (FL)
Baldacci	Cannon	Davis (IL)
Ballenger	Capps	Davis (VA)
Barr	Cardin	Deal
Barrett (NE)	Carson	DeLay
Bartlett	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Barton	Chabot	Dickey
Bateman	Chambliss	Dixon
Bereuter	Chenoweth	Dooley
Berry	Christensen	Doolittle
Bilbray	Clay	Doyle
Bilirakis	Clayton	Duncan
Bishop	Clement	Edwards
Bliley	Coble	Ehlers
Blumenauer	Coburn	Ehrlich
Boehlert	Collins	Emerson
Boehner	Combest	English
Bonilla	Condit	Ensign
Bonior	Cook	Etheridge
Bono	Cooksey	Everett
Borski	Costello	Ewing
Boswell	Cox	Fattah
Boyd	Coyne	Fawell
Brown (FL)	Cramer	Foley
Bryant	Crane	Forbes
Bunning	Crapo	Fowler
Burton	Cubin	Fox

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H769

Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Roukema
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Royce
Gibbons	Luther	Rush
Gilchrest	Manton	Ryun
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sabo
Gilman	Markey	Salmon
Goode	Mascara	Sanford
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Goodling	McCollum	Saxton
Gordon	McDade	Scarborough
Goss	McHale	Schaefer, Dan
Graham	McHugh	Schaffer, Bob
Granger	McInnis	Scott
Green	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Greenwood	McIntyre	Sessions
Gutierrez	McKeon	Shadegg
Gutknecht	McKinney	Shaw
Hall (TX)	Meek	Shays
Hamilton	Menendez	Sherman
Hansen	Metcalfe	Shimkus
Hastert	Mica	Sisisky
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Hefley	Minge	Skeen
Hill	Moakley	Skelton
Hilleary	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Hilliard	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Smith (OR)
Holden	Morella	Smith (TX)
Horn	Murtha	Smith, Linda
Hostettler	Myrick	Snowbarger
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Snyder
Hunter	Neumann	Solomon
Hyde	Ney	Souder
Inglis	Northup	Spence
Istook	Norwood	Spratt
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Stearns
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Stenholm
(TX)	Ortiz	Stokes
Jenkins	Oxley	Stump
Johnson, E. B.	Packard	Sununu
Johnson, Sam	Pappas	Talent
Jones	Parker	Tanner
Kanjorski	Pascarell	Taylor (NC)
Kasich	Pastor	Thomas
Kelly	Paul	Thornberry
Kildee	Pease	Thune
Kim	Peterson (MN)	Thurman
Kind (WI)	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
King (NY)	Petri	Traficant
Kingston	Pickering	Turner
Klink	Pickett	Upton
Klug	Pitts	Velazquez
Knollenberg	Pombo	Vento
Kolbe	Porter	Visclosky
Kucinich	Portman	Walsh
LaFalce	Poshard	Wamp
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Watkins
Lampson	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Largent	Radanovich	Waxman
Latham	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Leach	Regula	Weller
Lewis (CA)	Riley	White
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Whitfield
Lewis (KY)	Roemer	Wicker
Linder	Rogan	Wolf
Livingston	Rogers	Woolsey
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—64

Ackerman	Gallegly	Nadler
Archer	Ganske	Paxon
Baesler	Gonzalez	Pomeroy
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Rangel
Bass	Hastings (WA)	Riggs
Bentsen	Herger	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hinchey	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Hoekstra	Sanchez
Brady	Houghton	Sanders
Burr	Hutchinson	Schiff
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Schumer
Canady	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Conyers	Kleczka	Shuster
DeFazio	LaTourette	Stabenow
Delahunt	Levin	Strickland
Dingell	Lofgren	Stupak
Dreier	Maloney (NY)	Tauzin
Dunn	McCarthy (MO)	Wise
Engel	McCrery	Young (AK)
Flake	McGovern	Young (FL)
Foglietta	McNulty	
Furse	Molinari	

□ 1024

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. OXLEY, SHIMKUS, FOX of Pennsylvania, JACKSON of Illinois, THOMAS,

LAMPSON, BOYD, and DIXON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS and Mr. JOHN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been present for rollcall vote No. 32, I would have voted "nay."

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 811

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 811.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## CLOSING THE BOOKS ON AMERICORPS WILL START THE BALANCED BUDGET PROCESS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has defeated the balanced budget. We have heard repeatedly from the party of big government, the opponents of the balanced budget, that we do not need to amend the Constitution to balance the budget. We can do it right now.

I say it is time to put our money where our mouths are. Let us get started. Today I am introducing legislation to eliminate the President's AmeriCorps program, the largest Government service program since the 1930's. AmeriCorps spends \$400 million a year to pay volunteers, which is a paradox in terms and, in many cases, for them just to serve as low-level Federal bureaucrats.

□ 1030

The GAO has reported the average AmeriCorps paid volunteer receives \$26,000 a year in compensation. This program makes politicians feel good and lets us talk about our high-minded ideals.

I pose this simple question: Is this program so important that we want to

borrow the money against our children's future to pay for the program?

We have heard much talk about balancing the budget and the President has even said in this Chamber that the era of big government is over. Let us help him to fulfill his proclamation. Talk will not balance the budget, but spending less will. Let us start by closing the books on AmeriCorps.

## IN TRIBUTE TO SAMOAN HEAVYWEIGHT BOXER DAVID TUA

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special member of our Samoan community here in these United States of America, heavyweight boxer David Tua, who was recently honored in Honolulu as the Samoan professional athlete of the year.

Mr. Speaker, David Tua, now only 23 years old, became heavyweight champion of New Zealand at a very young age and subsequently represented New Zealand at the Barcelona Olympics, where he was awarded a bronze medal.

This young athlete has a most impressive record as a professional boxer. David Tua is the first Polynesian and the first Samoan to be ranked 8th in the world in the heavyweight division. He has won every single one of his 26 professional fights, 22 by knockouts, and 11 of those were knockouts in the first round.

The great fighter, Mr. Mike Tyson, currently holds the record, Mr. Speaker, with 15 knockouts in the first round.

David Tua is an inspiration and a champion role model for the Samoan community, working with and encouraging our youth to maintain strong ties with their families and to study hard in school.

Keep an eye on David Tua.

## CHILDREN'S HEALTH

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the central points of the democratic Families First program has been a commitment to improving children's health care.

Last summer in Houston we hosted an immunization day to offer inner city children free immunization as a step toward providing them with critical preventative health care. And we will do it again this year. But that is not enough.

The Democratic Members of Congress know children's health is an issue that deserves our attention. In millions of American households with one or two working parents, children are excluded from their health care coverage. Ninety percent of the 10 million American

children who are uninsured have parents who work but whose employers cannot or do not provide health care coverage for the children.

The Democratic plan will help children get coverage by requiring insurance companies to offer kids-only health plans and tax credits to help families pay for those premiums. The Democratic families first agenda will indeed offer real improvements to every life for America's working families, especially our children.

Let us work together bipartisanship to improve the health care for America's 10 million uninsured children.

#### A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as a father I am concerned about not only my children but about the health and well-being of all children in this country. That is why I support a balanced budget amendment and a real balanced budget. But Mr. Clinton has determined that we will have neither.

The Clinton administration work feverishly to defeat the BBA, and the balanced budget they submitted earlier this year falls short of balancing the budget by \$69 billion.

Mr. Speaker, our children deserve better. They deserve a future that is bright and free of the debt that this Government keeps piling on them year after year. We literally take money out of the back pockets of our children when we do not balance the budget.

The last time America had a balanced budget was 1969. Since then we have accumulated over \$5.3 trillion in national debt. It is a shame that the White House would block the only way to ensure our children will not have to face an 80- to 90-percent tax rate when they grow up to become taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, we need to balance the budget, we need a balanced budget amendment.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, reports say that record numbers of illegal immigrants keep running across the border, many with backpacks full of heroin and cocaine. To boot, the Immigration and Naturalization Service just granted citizenship to 71,000 criminals, 71,000 criminals.

Now, if that is not enough to tax your prison, check this out. For quote unquote "excellent work," the Vice President just gave the Immigration and Naturalization Service the national performance hammer award. For what? For a Border Patrol program known as Ollie, Ollie In Free.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. The Immigration and Naturalization Service

does not warrant or deserve awards. They should be getting subpoenas from the Justice Department.

I yield back the balance of all this prison space that will be taken up.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton has stated over and over his commitment to producing a real balanced budget. I do not doubt his commitment. It is his math that I am worried about. The CBO predicts the President's most recent budget will have a \$69 billion deficit in the year 2002, when there should be no deficit.

Mr. Speaker, we see that the White House worked feverishly to defeat a balanced budget amendment. Now we see why. He has no intention of producing a real balanced budget. During his State of the Union Address the President said, and I quote, "Balancing the budget requires only your vote and my signature. It does not require us to rewrite our Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, who is the President kidding? If he cannot even produce a balanced budget, why should we expect him to sign one? Instead of lip service, Bill Clinton should send Congress a real budget using real numbers and one that actually adds up.

#### UNINSURED CHILDREN

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over 175 Democratic Members have signed a letter to the Republican leadership urging a date certain for floor consideration of legislation that provides health insurance coverage for the 10 million American kids that do not have it. So far the Republican leadership refuses to address the issue of kids health insurance. Last week many of my Democratic colleagues discussed a recent New York City survey that pointed to the growing numbers of children without health insurance.

Today the GOP is supposed to unveil its long-overdue legislative agenda for the 105th Congress. A present view of that agenda published in today's newspapers does not mention kids health insurance. Nor did the Republicans include the issue when they talked about a bipartisan agenda with President Clinton a few weeks ago.

I want to assure my colleagues, though, that this issue will not go away because the Democrats will not allow it to. It is a disgrace that 10 million American children, most of whose parents work very hard, do not have health care coverage.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about American families and American children and health care, and I know that the one way we can achieve that is to balance our budget. We will not achieve it if we do not balance our budget.

The President has sent down his budget. It is \$69 or \$70 billion out of balance when we get to the year 2002. In fact, the deficit is going to go up \$14 billion before it starts to go down. The American people are smart. We can tell them we are going to balance the budget, and the President can say it; but whether we come back with a plan that raises the deficit and then leaves 75 percent of the balancing of the budget to be done in the next administration, they know we are blowing smoke at them.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a job to do. The President has a responsibility to send a balanced budget down here. We need to get at it.

#### BLUE DOG COALITION BUDGET

(Mrs. TAUSCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that in my first opportunity to speak on the floor of the House, I am rising to voice my strong support for the blue dog coalition budget. The coalition budget is a commonsense approach to deficit reduction. It does not rely on gimmicks, nor do we postpone the tough cuts until the final years of the plan.

At this point the blue dog budget is the only budget plan that will balance the budget by the year 2002 and take the Social Security trust fund off budget by 2005. As Members of Congress, we must show our constituents that we can make the tough choices necessary to put our fiscal house in order. The coalition budget proves that we can balance the budget, save Medicare and Social Security, and preserve our commitment on education.

If we colleagues are truly looking to balance the budget in a bipartisan manner, I urge them to take a long hard look at the blue dog budget. This is the right plan for Democrats and Republicans to begin to form a truly bipartisan consensus on a balanced budget.

#### TIME FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this country is in a time of need. What our constituents need is a budget that will stay balanced. It is our obligation to provide that for them. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed a budget that does not offer what we

have been striving for. The Congressional Budget Office has revealed that this plan would leave an unsettled deficit of at least \$69 billion by the year 2002. Additionally, his Medicare proposal does not keep the Medicare plan in balance for 10 years as he has proposed.

Furthermore, his savings in Medicare essentially amount to a shell game, moving expenses from part A to part B, out of the Medicare plan into the general revenue which comes out of general withholding of all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the President send us an honest balanced budget, additionally that he send us a plan that will truly achieve solvency for the Medicare plan so that our seniors will be able to have the health care that they need.

#### HANDGUNS AND KIDS

(Mr. BLAGOJEVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago on Monday, a man named Stephen Young told me that his oldest son had been killed by an 18-year-old with a handgun.

His son, Andrew, had earned the national ranking in speed skating and planned to attend a Chicago area tech school this fall. But the 18-year-old with the handgun put a stop to that outside a neighborhood fruit market. Andrew's father said, I was really looking forward to knowing him as a man. But the 18-year-old with the handgun put a stop to that as well.

Mr. Speaker, 18-year-old males have the highest arrest rates for weapons offenses, but Federal law still allows them to possess handguns. It is time we in Congress put a stop to that. In the memory of Andrew Young and the countless others who have fallen victim to gun violence, I am proud to introduce a bill that would make it illegal for anyone under 21 to possess a handgun.

I urge my colleagues to join me in stopping the lethal mix of kids and guns.

#### IMPROVE THE GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity, and I rise today to introduce legislation together with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MCCARTHY] that would strengthen and improve the defense loan and technical assistance program, the so-called delta guaranteed loan program for small businesses.

As a former SBA Administrator, I saw firsthand the important relationship between defense industries and small businesses. Unfortunately in the

last decade with the downsizing of defense, we have seen areas of the country like my own Long Island, NY, region lose over 100,000 jobs as the defense industry cuts back.

This important delta program is needed to ease the transition between the defense-based business and moving them into other commercial applications. My legislation would provide for an extension of this important program for small businesses. It would expand the opportunities for small businesses to participate by allowing them to go back up to 7 years if they have done about 25 percent of their business in the defense industry. In addition, it would raise the guaranteed loan amount up to 90 percent so more banks could help small businesses. It is important legislation and I urge its consideration.

□ 1045

#### KIDS-ONLY HEALTH INSURANCE

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House overwhelmingly passed a resolution regarding the Ten Commandments on the grounds that religious doctrine is the cornerstone of a just and fair society. Yet there are 61 countries around the world that ensure or provide health care for all of their workers and dependents. The United States is not one of them.

In this country our children are falling behind on many crucial health indicators. Ten million American children have no health insurance. Millions more do not have meaningful access to health care providers. Their parents have to rely on emergency services to care for their children.

This is unconscionable. Ninety percent of uninsured children have parents that work but they have no coverage for their children through their employers. We must take action to require insurance companies to provide kids-only health insurance and to provide a tax credit to help parents pay the premiums. A fair and just society provides for the health and welfare of its children, our future.

#### THE WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Ms. GRANGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1, the Working Families Flexibility Act. Everett Dirksen once said nothing in the world can stop an idea whose time has come. Mr. Speaker, comp time is clearly such an idea.

This is a simple and straightforward piece of legislation that allows employees and employers the option of choos-

ing time off instead of overtime pay. In no way does this bill threaten the Fair Labor Standards Act, and in no way does this bill temper the rights of employees.

This is simply a bill which provides an option to help America's workers become full-time parents as well as full-time employees. Why do so many working men and women across America support comp time? They support comp time because it affords them choice.

For the mother of three working 40 hours a week, comp time means the choice to take time off and see her daughter's school play. For the father who is raising kids by himself, comp time means the choice to coach his son's little league team. And for the children of the 90's, comp time means a chance to spend more time with the two most important figures in their lives, their moms and dads.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1 as a means to an end. The means will be more choice for parents on how to manage their time, but more importantly, the end will be thousands of healthier, happier families. When this bill comes to the floor, I urge my colleagues to support it.

#### FIGHT FOR THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this country made a pact with our senior citizens. We promised our Nation's elderly that the Medicare Program would be there for them when they needed it most. Today the Medicare Program is one of our Nation's great success stories. Ninety-nine percent of our seniors have health care coverage in the United States today.

Last year Democrats stood up for our Nation's seniors and successfully fought to protect and preserve the Medicare Program. But surely our children are every bit as sacred as our senior citizens, and yet every day in this country another 3,300 kids lose their health insurance. This is a national crisis.

It is time for the Congress to focus on this problem because it is not going away. In fact, it is only getting worse. We need to stand up and fight for the health of our children just as we stood up and fought for the health of our seniors. We must act today and move the expansion of children's health care to the top of our legislative agenda.

#### SEND CONGRESS A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, you can't be a beacon if

your light don't shine. You can't have your cake and eat it too. You can't teach an old dog new tricks. What we have here is a failure to communicate. Show me the money. When the Lord closes a door, somewhere he opens a window. All I ever learned, I learned in kindergarten. There he goes again. Where's the beef? Just say no. Life is like a box of chocolates. Spare the rod, spoil the child. Over 69 billion served. Elvis lives. To be or not to be.

Mr. Speaker, by now you are probably wondering what all these annoying clichés and catch phrases have in common. It is simple. They all pertain to the Clinton fiscal year 1998 budget.

Mr. Speaker, the President should send Congress a real balanced budget. Waste not, want not.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD GET DOWN TO BUSINESS

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, according to the Congressional Management Foundation, it costs our Nation's taxpayers approximately \$280,000 to fly House Members to Washington each week when the Congress is in session. In the past, there has been a busy floor schedule and Members have been working in order to earn their keep.

Today is Thursday, March 6, and it may be the 105th Congress but so far, I think, it is the pretend Congress: Pretend we are meeting, pretend we are legislating, pretend we are busy, pretend we are working. This is not a source of pride to me, nor can it be to so many of my colleagues. All the American people want is to have their country work, and it cannot work if we do not work.

We passed the armored car reciprocity amendments, we sent best wishes to the people of Nicaragua, and we even mustered a handful of Members to come to the floor to listen to the President of Chile, but nothing is being done about campaign finance reform, health care for our Nation's children, and so many other things.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop wasting the taxpayers' dollars. Let us get down to business. Let us go to work for our great Nation.

#### AMERICA DESERVES AN HONEST BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the balanced budget amendment was defeated in the Senate by one vote. Again, the will of the American people is being thwarted because folks here promise one thing at home, then come to Washington and do something else.

It is ironic indeed that the Clinton White House worked so hard to defeat

the balanced budget amendment, when the budget they submitted to Congress is the best argument for a balanced budget amendment. Bill Clinton's budget is big government, more taxes, more programs, and status quo Washington, DC.

Clinton's budget contains temporary tax cuts but has permanent tax increases. The CBO has reported that in the year 2002, after Mr. Clinton is gone, the Government would run a \$70 billion deficit.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton's new budget is unbalanced and avoids the tough choices. America deserves an honest balanced budget, one without gimmicks or temporary tax cuts.

#### UNFUNDED SOCIAL SECURITY LIABILITY

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just an update of what is happening. Alan Greenspan, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, came in day before yesterday. As we know, June O'Neill of CBO is coming in today. They are both saying there is a difference in the rosy scenario or a more conservative expectation of what is going to come in revenues. Let us take the hard course. Let us take the more conservative estimate. Let us start cutting spending.

I know it is a tough job. We talk about all these expenditures. Let me give my colleagues one example: Social Security. We are accumulating an additional \$380 billion a year increased actuarial debts or unfunded liability in Social Security. The longer we put off those decisions, the more drastic those solutions are going to have to be in the future.

I figured it by minute because it is big dollars if you figure the \$370 billion we are spending a year. Every minute on Social Security we are spending \$700,000. By 2030 every minute we are going to be spending \$5,700,000. Let us get at it and solve these problems.

#### BALANCE THE BUDGET FOR OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a father of four kids, I have Betsy who is 13, John who is 11, and I have Ann who is 8 and Jim who is 6, I am very, very concerned about their future.

We are working real hard with them on their homework, teaching them math and English and all the good stuff children all over America are doing, but one thing that is very scary to me as I put them to bed every night is that I know looming out there in the future is this dark cloud of the national debt: \$5.1 trillion already.

Now we have a President who says he will support a balanced budget amendment, and then he submits a budget that is not even balanced. The Clinton budget in the year 2002 has a \$69 billion deficit, and all the savings there are are on the back end, far after he has left the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to please come forward, think about not just my kids, think about all the children in America. Let us really do something for the youth of America and balance the budget and quit spending their money.

#### HONORING MANUAL HIGH SCHOOL'S BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would deliver my 1 minute on this side of the aisle today, given the fact that we are beginning, this weekend, the first historic bipartisan retreat, where over 220 Members from both sides of the aisle will depart to Hershey, PA, with 165 spouses and 100 children to begin to work together and, hopefully, develop a rapport so that we can carry out the people's business in a more civil way.

Today, I rise, though, to pay tribute to a high school basketball team in my hometown of Peoria, the Manual Rams, who are currently ranked No. 1 in the country by USA Today. The Manual Rams have been ranked No. 1 for the past 5 weeks. The team is led by head coach Wayne McClain and has three all-State players: Marcus Griffin, Sergio McClain, and Frankie Williams.

Manual is the three-time defending Illinois State champion and they are currently on track to win an unprecedented fourth consecutive championship this month as we begin March Madness in Illinois, which will take place in my hometown of Peoria. The team's current record is 24-1.

The City of Peoria and all of Central Illinois is proud to have the Manual Rams as a representative in USA Today High School Rankings. Congratulations to Coach McClain and the Manual Rams. We are very proud of their teamwork, dedication, and sportsmanship.

#### WEST VIRGINIA HARD HIT BY FLOOD WATERS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, let me report that as the flood waters are receding, mercifully, in West Virginia, we have many areas that have been hard hit: Sistersville, Clendenin, the counties Calhoun and Wirt, Mason, Braxton, Gilmer, Roane and Putnam all have suffered unprecedented flood damage.

Of course, Governor Underwood, the volunteers, the emergency services, the

National Guard, all have done an incredible job in this first stage of flood recovery.

Now comes the second stage, Mr. Speaker, because shortly the Federal disaster declaration will be made. At that time there will be a toll-free number for all residents in West Virginia to call the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and there they can apply for housing assistance, small business loans, unemployment assistance, crisis counseling, and a range of other assistance.

Working with the Governor, Mr. Speaker, and the FEMA staff, my staff and I will be fanning out across the State as soon as this disaster declaration is made to work with local officials and to work with residents and to get the information out about how to get that assistance.

The first stage, Mr. Speaker, of this flood recovery is coming to an end, and that is basically to preserve life, health, and property. And now we begin the second stage. And as we do, all West Virginians should know that with the Federal disaster declaration that will be coming shortly, they will not be left alone. The second stage begins and so does our recovery.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1997

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1997

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 10, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 11, 1997, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1100

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 5, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington,  
DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, I hereby submit my resignation from the Committee on Education and the Workplace.

Sincerely,

EARL BLUMENAUER,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 84) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 84

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and that they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Earl Blumenauer of Oregon, to rank directly below Elijah Cummings of Maryland.

To the Committee on Education and the Workforce: Dennis Kucinich of Ohio.

To the Committee on budget: James McDermott of Washington.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

If postponed, such proceedings will resume after disposition of proceedings de novo on the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL CONTRACT REVIEW REFORM ACT OF 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 513) to exempt certain contracts entered into by the government of the District of Columbia from review by the Council of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 513

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Council Contract Review Reform Act of 1997".

#### SEC. 2. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FROM COUNCIL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 451 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act (sec. 1-1130, D.C. Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—The requirements of this section shall not apply with respect to any of the following contracts:

"(1) Any contract entered into by the Washington Convention Center Authority for preconstruction activities, project management, design, or construction.

"(2) Any contract entered into by the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority established pursuant to the Water and Sewer authority Establishment and Department of Public Works Reorganization Act of 1996, other than contracts for the sale or lease of the Blue Plains Wastewater Treatment Plant.

"(3) At the option of the Council, any contract for a highway improvement project carried out under title 23, United States Code."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very small matter for us, but it is urgently needed for the District of Columbia Council and two of its independent agencies charged with the important issue of water and sewer service and construction of a new convention center.

This legislation was introduced late in the 104th Congress and fell through the cracks in our rush to adjournment. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the ranking member, being willing to allow this measure to come before the House outside the regular process. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Chairman BURTON for permitting expeditious consideration of this bill.

H.R. 513, the District of Columbia Council Review Reform Act, is an important bill for the city's recovery. It enables two independent agencies, the Washington Convention Center Authority, and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, to carry out their mission in a more efficient and cost-effective manner. Timely passage

of this bill is of the essence in particular for the Convention Center Authority so as to avoid delays by taking full advantage of the construction season.

For many years the council has sought authority to review city contracts in excess of \$1 million. The council had numerous times passed legislation to accomplish this objective but had been unable to override executive vetoes. Congress was eventually asked to resolve this dispute, and we did so with the passage of the 1995 District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, Public Law 104-8. This legislation, establishing the control board, requires in section 304 that no contract involving expenditures in excess of \$1 million during a 12-month period may be made unless the mayor submits the contract to the council for its approval and the council approves the contract.

The District of Columbia Convention Center Authority and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority were created as independent entities in order to remove them to the fullest extent possible from the political process. They are both key elements in our continuing efforts to reform essential city services and help restore confidence of the private sector.

The Convention Center Authority was created by the D.C. City Council in 1994, and the Water and Sewer Authority in 1996. In 1995, Congress passed legislation to permit the Convention Center Authority to expend certain revenues for its operation and maintenance. And in 1996 Congress passed legislation facilitating as well the operation of the new Water and Sewer Authority.

A consequence of the Convention Center Authority legislation became apparent when it sought to contract for a project manager. The law was interpreted as prohibiting discretion on the part of the council, and requiring review. At that point the losing bidders commenced lobbying the council to overturn the decision of the Convention Center Authority, which had already been endorsed by the control board. While the contract was eventually approved, precious time and effort were needlessly expended. The same consequence would apply to Water and Sewer Authority contracts.

When the inadvertent application of the control board legislation to both the Convention Center Authority and the Water and Sewer Authority was realized, efforts were made to rectify the situation. H.R. 3664, the District of Columbia Government Improvement and Efficiency Act of 1996, included a section exempting all contracts entered into by the Washington Convention Center Authority and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority from review by the city council. This section also authorized the city council to exempt highway projects carried out under title 23 of the United States Code. But H.R. 3664, though it was marked up by both my subcommittee

and the full Government Reform and Oversight Committee, was unable to move forward due to a disagreement which arose on a completely different section of the bill.

This bill is necessary in order to avoid unnecessary delays in the very important work of the Convention Center Authority and the Water and Sewer Authority and to allow the council to eliminate delays in awarding highway contracts for bids already approved by the Federal Highway Administration. H.R. 513 removes the potential for Convention Center Authority and Water and Sewer Authority contracts to be handled in a way opposite the one that clearly is intended by the creation of these independent entities.

After consultation with the city council, the bill authorizes the council to change the way it handles Federal highway projects so as to conform local practice to the practice that exists in most States. The city council has indicated that it would like to establish such a process. This is presently prohibited because the control board legislation requiring council review of contracts is a Federal law and the council cannot change it.

All of the contracts referred to in this legislation are still subject to review by the control board. The Congressional Budget Office has certified that this bill would not affect the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 513.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND  
OVERSIGHT—BRIEFING MEMO

On Thursday, March 6, 1997, at 10:00 a.m., H.R. 513, is scheduled for floor action on the Suspension Calendar. This bill, the District of Columbia Council Contract Review Reform Act of 1997, is sponsored by Subcommittee Chairman Tom Davis and Ranking Member Eleanor Holmes Norton of the House District of Columbia Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The purpose of the bill is to exempt certain contracts entered into by the District of Columbia government from review by the District Council.

H.R. 513 was introduced on February 4, 1997, and referred to the Government Reform and Oversight Committee. Chairman Dan Burton agreed to expeditious consideration of the bill on the Suspension Calendar. There is no known opposition to the bill. The Congressional Budget Office has certified in writing that the bill does not effect the federal budget.

H.R. 513 is necessary at this time in order to facilitate the clear intention of Congress in its passage of legislation establishing the control board (P.L. 104-8), and the legislation creating the Washington Convention Center Authority and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority. Timely passage of this bill is particularly essential for the Convention Center Authority so as to avoid delays by taking full advantage of the construction season.

For many years the District of Columbia Council had sought authority to review City contracts in excess of \$1 million. Legislation to accomplish this objective was repeatedly vetoed by the Mayor. The Council was unable to override these vetoes. Congress was

asked to resolve the matter and sought to do so with passage of P.L. 104-8 in 1995, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. This landmark legislation, establishing the control board, requires in Section 304 that no contract involving expenditures in excess of \$1 million during a 12 month period may be made unless the Mayor submits the contract to the Council for its approval and the Council approves the contract. Section 304 is mandatory, not discretionary.

It soon became apparent that the mandatory, all-inclusive nature of Section 304 of P.L. 104-8 created serious problems in particular for the Convention Center Authority. The Washington Convention Center Authority, and the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority were created as independent entities in order to remove them to the fullest extent possible from the political process. They are both key elements in continuing efforts by Congress to reform essential City services and help restore confidence in the private sector.

The Convention Center Authority was created by the D.C. Council in 1994, and the Water and Sewer Authority in 1996. In 1995 Congress passed the District of Columbia Convention Center and Sports Arena Authorization Act of 1995 to permit the Convention Center Authority to expend certain revenues for its operation and maintenance. And in 1996 Congress passed the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority Act of 1996 to authorize the issuance of bonds with respect to water and sewer facilities.

When the Convention Center Authority proceeded to contract for a Project Manager the adverse consequences of requiring Council review became apparent. Though the contract had been approved by the control board the losing bidders appealed to the Council to overturn the decision. The contract was eventually approved, but precious time and energy were wasted.

When the inadvertent application of the control board legislation to both the Convention Center Authority and the Water and Sewer Authority was realized last year steps were taken to rectify the situation. H.R. 3664, the District of Columbia Government Improvement and Efficiency Act of 1996 included a section exempting all contracts entered into by the Convention Center Authority and the Water and Sewer Authority from review by the City Council. This section of H.R. 3664 also authorized the City Council to exempt highway projects carried out under Title 23 of the U.S. Code. But H.R. 3664, though it was marked-up by both the House District Oversight Subcommittee and the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, was unable to move forward due to a disagreement which arose on a completely different section of the bill.

H.R. 513 also authorizes the District of Columbia City Council to change the way it handles Federal highway projects so as to conform local practice to the practice that exists in most states. After consultation with the City Council it was concluded that they would favor establishing such a process. They are prohibited from doing so now because the control board legislation requiring Council review of contracts is a federal law and the Council cannot change it.

All of the contracts referred to in this legislation are still subject to review by the control board.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 513 is a bipartisan bill authored by the District of Columbia Subcommittee's chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], its ranking member. It would simply exempt contracts over \$1 million entered into by the District's Water and Sewer Authority and Convention Center Authority from review and approval by the city council. These two authorities were established by the Council during the last 2 years as corporate bodies with a legal existence apart from the District government. Each authority has its own board of directors, financial system, and revenue sources. Their independence was an essential element of their design, and it is critical to the realization of their respective missions.

Two years ago, Congress approved legislation developed by the D.C. Subcommittee establishing the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, Public Law 104-8. This bill contained a provision amending the District's home rule charter to require council review of all contracts over \$1 million. This was done in order to inject greater control and accountability into the District's procurement process.

It has since been learned through consultation with various financial advisers that we could lower the risk associated with any borrowing by the two authorities and thereby reduce their borrowing costs if we insulated the larger contracts of the two authorities from the review process and the politics which sometimes affect it.

Finally, the bill would permit the city council at its option to exempt from its review any Federal aid highway program contract over \$1 million. The council has indicated that it would prefer to annually approve a schedule of projects to be undertaken under this program rather than consider project contracts on an individual basis. This approach will expedite the procurement process and ensure work can get started during the construction season.

I should point out that all of the contracts which this bill will exempt from council review will still be subject to review and approval by the District's Financial Authority, the Control Board. The authority will ensure that they have been executed appropriately and are consistent with the District's budget and financial plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this bill does nothing more than streamline an administrative review process of the council. It enjoys the support of the District's local officials. Accordingly, I urge its approval by this body.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 513.

The question was taken.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question de novo on the approval of the Journal, and then on the motion to suspend the rules postponed from earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The first vote will be on the Journal, de novo; the second vote will be on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 513, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 43, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—355

Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Bernman  
Berry  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop

Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Campbell  
Canady

Cannon  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clayton  
Clement  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane

Crapo  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Holden  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (WI)  
Johnson, Sam

Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Northup  
Norwood  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pappas  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paul  
Paxon  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard

Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skeltton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Adam  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Snyder  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Torres  
Traficant  
Turner  
Upton  
Vento  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Wexler  
Weygand  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—43

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Pascrell
Baldacci	Hefley	Pickett
Bonior	Hilliard	Pombo
Borski	Hulshof	Ramstad
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Clay	Kennelly	Scott
Clyburn	Kucinich	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Thompson
English	McDermott	Velazquez
Ensign	McIntosh	Visclosky
Filner	Menendez	Waters
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Ney	Weller
Gibbons	Nussle	
Green	Oberstar	

## NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman	Gallegly	Pomeroy
Baessler	Hinchey	Sanchez
Barcia	Hoekstra	Schiff
Camp	Kilpatrick	Schumer
Conyers	Levin	Shuster
Davis (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Skaggs
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
Dreier	McGovern	Strickland
Engel	McKeon	Stupak
Ewing	McNulty	Towns
Flake	Myrick	
Furse	Nadler	

□ 1129

So the Journal was approved.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been present for rollcall vote 33, I would have voted "Aye."

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL CONTRACT REVIEW REFORM ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 513.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 513, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 7, answered "present" 1, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

## YEAS—390

Abercrombie	Blagojevich	Canady
Aderholt	Bliley	Cannon
Allen	Blumenauer	Capps
Andrews	Blunt	Cardin
Archer	Boehlert	Carson
Army	Boehner	Castle
Bachus	Bonilla	Chabot
Baker	Bonior	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bono	Chenoweth
Ballenger	Borski	Christensen
Barr	Boswell	Clay
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Clayton
Barrett (WI)	Boyd	Clement
Bartlett	Brady	Clyburn
Barton	Brown (CA)	Coble
Bass	Brown (FL)	Coburn
Bateman	Brown (OH)	Collins
Becerra	Bryant	Combest
Bentsen	Bunning	Condit
Bereuter	Burr	Cook
Berman	Burton	Cooksey
Berry	Buyer	Costello
Bilbray	Callahan	Cox
Bilirakis	Calvert	Coyne
Bishop	Campbell	Cramer

Crane	Hyde	Oxley
Crapo	Inglis	Packard
Cubin	Istook	Pallone
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Pappas
Cunningham	Jackson-Lee	Parker
Danner	(TX)	Pascrell
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Pastor
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Paxon
Davis (VA)	John	Payne
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Pease
DeFazio	Johnson (WI)	Pelosi
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Delahunt	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
DeLauro	Jones	Petri
DeLay	Kanjorski	Pickering
Dellums	Kaptur	Pickett
Deutsch	Kasich	Pitts
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Pombo
Dickey	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Dicks	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Dixon	Kennelly	Poshard
Doggett	Kildee	Price (NC)
Dooley	Kim	Pryce (OH)
Doolittle	Kind (WI)	Quinn
Doyle	King (NY)	Radanovich
Duncan	Kingston	Rahall
Dunn	Klecza	Ramstad
Edwards	Klink	Regula
Ehlers	Klug	Reyes
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Riggs
Emerson	Kolbe	Riley
English	LaFalce	Rivers
Ensign	LaHood	Roemer
Eshoo	Lampson	Rogan
Etheridge	Lantos	Rogers
Evans	Largent	Rohrabacher
Everett	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Ewing	LaTourette	Rothman
Farr	Lazio	Roukema
Fattah	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Fazio	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Ryun
Foglietta	Linder	Sabo
Foley	Lipinski	Salmon
Forbes	Livingston	Sanders
Ford	LoBiondo	Sandlin
Fowler	Lofgren	Sanford
Fox	Lowe	Sawyer
Frank (MA)	Lucas	Saxton
Franks (NJ)	Luther	Scarborough
Frelinghuysen	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Frost	Manton	Sensenbrenner
Ganske	Manzullo	Serrano
Gejdenson	Markey	Sessions
Gekas	Martinez	Shadegg
Gephardt	Mascara	Shaw
Gibbons	Matsui	Shays
Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Gillmor	McCollum	Shimkus
Gilman	McCrery	Sisisky
Gonzalez	McDade	Skeen
Goode	McDermott	Skelton
Goodlatte	McHale	Slaughter
Goodling	McHugh	Smith (MI)
Gordon	McInnis	Smith (NJ)
Goss	McIntosh	Smith (OR)
Graham	McIntyre	Smith (TX)
Granger	McKinney	Smith, Adam
Green	Meehan	Smith, Linda
Greenwood	Meek	Snowbarger
Gutierrez	Menendez	Snyder
Gutknecht	Metcalf	Solomon
Hall (OH)	Mica	Souder
Hall (TX)	Millender-McDonald	Spence
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Spratt
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Stark
Harman	Minge	Stenholm
Hastert	Mink	Stokes
Hastings (FL)	Moakley	Sununu
Hastings (WA)	Molinari	Talent
Hayworth	Mollohan	Tanner
Hefley	Moran (KS)	Tauscher
Hefner	Moran (VA)	Tauzin
Hergert	Morella	Taylor (MS)
Hill	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Hilleary	Myrick	Thomas
Hilliard	Neal	Thompson
Hinojosa	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Hobson	Neumann	Thune
Holden	Ney	Thurman
Hooley	Northup	Tiaht
Horn	Norwood	Tierney
Hostettler	Nussle	Torres
Houghton	Oberstar	Trafigant
Hoyer	Olver	Turner
Hulshof	Ortiz	Upton
Hunter	Owens	Velazquez
Hutchinson		Vento

Visclosky	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Walsh	Wexler	Woolsey
Wamp	Weygand	Wynn
Watkins	White	Yates
Watt (NC)	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Watts (OK)	Wicker	Young (FL)
Waxman	Wise	

## NAYS—7

Kucinich	Schaffer, Bob	Weller
Paul	Stearns	
Schaefer, Dan	Stump	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

## NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman	Hoekstra	Schiff
Baessler	Kilpatrick	Schumer
Barcia	Levin	Shuster
Camp	Maloney (NY)	Skaggs
Conyers	McCarthy (MO)	Stabenow
Dingell	McGovern	Strickland
Dreier	McKeon	Stupak
Engel	McNulty	Towns
Flake	Nadler	Waters
Furse	Pomeroy	Weldon (FL)
Gallegly	Rangel	
Hinchey	Sanchez	

□ 1140

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 34, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1145

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 85) electing members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RIGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I am just curious as to the gentleman's motion, being the ranking member on the committee.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] to get a full explanation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that it is the appointment of Democrats and Republicans to the Joint Committee on Printing. We had gone over the list and cleared it. It is just that it is a unanimous consent, and we wanted to make sure that we were able to get it in prior to the possibility of a motion to adjourn.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 85

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following joint committees of Congress, to serve with the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Ney, Ms. Granger, Mr. Hoyer, and Mr. Gejdenson.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Ney, Mr. Ehlers, Ms. Kilpatrick, and Mr. Gejdenson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and the SPEAKER pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 84, nays 312, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

#### YEAS—84

Abercrombie	Gekas	Miller (CA)
Blumenauer	Greenwood	Mink
Borski	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Brown (CA)	Harman	Murtha
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Capps	Hooley	Nussle
Carson	Jefferson	Oberstar
Clay	John	Olver
DeFazio	Johnson (WI)	Owens
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Parker
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Sandlin
Dicks	Kennelly	Sherman
Dixon	Lantos	Slaughter
Doggett	Lowey	Stark
Eshoo	Maloney (CT)	Tauscher
Farr	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Martinez	Tierney
Fazio	Matsui	Torres
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	Traficant
Foglietta	McDade	Turner
Ford	McDermott	Vento
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Waters
Frelinghuysen	Millender-	
Gejdenson	McDonald	

Watt (NC)  
Weller

Wexler  
Weygand

Wynn  
Yates

#### NAYS—312

Aderholt	Fox	Mica
Allen	Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Andrews	Ganske	Minge
Archer	Gibbons	Molinari
Armey	Gilchrest	Mollohan
Bachus	Gillmor	Moran (KS)
Baker	Gilman	Moran (VA)
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Morella
Ballenger	Goode	Myrick
Barr	Goodlatte	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Goodling	Neumann
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Ney
Bartlett	Goss	Northup
Barton	Graham	Norwood
Bass	Granger	Obey
Bateman	Green	Ortiz
Becerra	Gutierrez	Oxley
Bentsen	Gutknecht	Packard
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Pappas
Berman	Hamilton	Pascrell
Berry	Hansen	Pastor
Bilbray	Hastert	Paul
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Bishop	Hayworth	Payne
Bliley	Hefley	Pease
Blunt	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hill	Petri
Bonilla	Hilleary	Pickering
Bono	Hilliard	Pickett
Boswell	Hinojosa	Pitts
Boucher	Hobson	Pombo
Boyd	Holden	Pomeroy
Brady	Horn	Porter
Brown (FL)	Hostettler	Portman
Bryant	Houghton	Poshard
Bunning	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Burr	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Hunter	Quinn
Buyer	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Callahan	Hyde	Rahall
Calvert	Inglis	Ramstad
Campbell	Istook	Rangel
Canady	Jackson (IL)	Regula
Cannon	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Cardin	(TX)	Riggs
Castle	Jenkins	Riley
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Chenoweth	Jones	Rogan
Christensen	Kasich	Rogers
Clayton	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Clement	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Kim	Rothman
Coburn	Kind (WI)	Roukema
Collins	King (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Combest	Kingston	Royce
Condit	Klecza	Rush
Cook	Klink	Ryun
Cooksey	Klug	Salmon
Costello	Knollenberg	Sanders
Cox	Kolbe	Sanford
Coyne	Kucinich	Sawyer
Cramer	LaFalce	Saxton
Crane	LaHood	Scarborough
Crapo	Lampson	Schaefer, Dan
Cubin	Largent	Schaffer, Bob
Cummings	Latham	Scott
Cunningham	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Danner	Lazio	Sessions
Davis (FL)	Leach	Shadegg
Davis (IL)	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
DeLay	Linder	Sisisky
DeKeyser	Lipinski	Skaggs
Dooley	Livingston	Skeen
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Skelton
Doyle	LoFgren	Smith (MI)
Duncan	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Luther	Smith (OR)
Edwards	Manton	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Manzullo	Smith, Linda
Ehrlich	Mascara	Snowbarger
Emerson	McCollum	Snyder
English	McCrery	Solomon
Ensign	McHale	Souder
Etheridge	McHugh	Spence
Evans	McInnis	Spratt
Everett	McIntosh	Stearns
Ewing	McIntyre	Stenholm
Fawell	McKinney	Stokes
Foley	Meek	Stump
Forbes	Menendez	Sununu
Fowler	Metcalf	Talent

Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Towns

Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)

White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Flake	McKeon
Baesler	Frost	McNulty
Barcia	Furse	Nadler
Blagojevich	Gallegly	Sanchez
Bonior	Gephardt	Schiff
Camp	Hinchey	Schumer
Clyburn	Hoekstra	Serrano
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Levin	Smith, Adam
Dingell	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Dreier	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland
Engel	McGovern	Stupak

#### □ 1201

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, due to the passing of my good friend and the former New York State Speaker of the Assembly Stanley Fink, I was unable to cast recorded votes today, March 6, 1997.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been present for rollcall vote 35, I would have voted "nay."

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on International Relations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 6, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
*Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: Effective immediately, I hereby resign from the Committee on International Relations.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. KUCINICH,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### 1997 TRADE POLICY AGENDA AND 1996 ANNUAL REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1997 Trade Policy Agenda and 1996 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 1997.

#### LLOYD GAMBLE

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to compensate Lloyd Gamble, a veteran who served our country with honor but was used as a guinea pig by our military.

In 1944, Lloyd Gamble enlisted in the U.S. Army and subsequently transferred to the U.S. Air Force, and to Lloyd Gamble the military was his life. In 1958, his promising, successful career was cut short when the Army used an experimental secret drug testing program administered by them to study the effects of LSD on humans. They denied this program ever existed until an aggressive congressional investigation proved otherwise in 1975.

Lloyd Gamble, used as a guinea pig by our military without his knowledge or permission, salvaged his marriage but his career was cut short. This legislation I hope can be acted on quickly by this body so that we can give him the compensation that he deserves. We have the opportunity to uphold the pledge which we heard just moments ago, with liberty and justice for all. Let us give Lloyd Gamble the justice he deserves.

I ask my colleagues to support and help pass this legislation and move it to the other body quickly for expeditious review.

H.R.—

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.

(a) PAYMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd B. Gamble of Fairfax, Virginia, the sum of \$253,488.

(b) BASIS.—The payment required by subsection (a) shall be to compensate Lloyd B. Gamble for the injuries sustained by him as a result of the administration to him, without his knowledge, of lysergic acid diethylamide by United States Army personnel in 1957.

#### SEC. 2 SATISFACTION OF CLAIMS.

The payment made pursuant to section 1 shall be in full satisfaction of all claims Lloyd B. Gamble may have against the United States for any injury described in such section.

#### SEC. 3. INELIGIBILITY FOR ADDITIONAL BENEFITS.

Upon payment of the sum referred to in section 1, Lloyd B. Gamble shall not be eligible for any compensation or benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense for any injury described in such section.

#### SEC. 4. LIMITATION OF AGENTS AND ATTORNEYS FEES.

It shall be unlawful for an amount of more than 10 percent of the amount paid pursuant to section 1 to be paid to or received by any agent or attorney for any service rendered to Lloyd B. Gamble in connection with the benefits provided by this Act. Any person who violates this section shall be guilty of an infraction and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided in title 18, United States Code.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1997, FOR FISCAL YEARS 1997-2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period, fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 178, for legislation having spending or revenue effects in fiscal years 1997 through 2001.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate applications of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of February 28, 1997.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997 as adjusted pursuant to 606(e) of the Budget Act for continuing disability reviews. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1997 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new en-

titlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 602(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 178 for fiscal year 1997 and for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1997 with the revised "section 602(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) sub-allocation. The revised section 602(b) sub-allocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on September 27, 1996.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,  
Chairman.

Enclosures.

#### REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178

[Reflecting action completed as of February 28, 1997—on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	1997	1997-2001
Appropriate Level (as amended by P.L. 104-93):		
Budget authority .....	1,314,935	6,956,507
Outlays .....	1,311,321	6,898,627
Revenues .....	1,083,728	5,913,303
Current Level:		
Budget authority .....	1,331,836	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	1,323,900	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	1,104,262	5,975,917
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget authority .....	16,901	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	12,579	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	20,534	62,614

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 1997 through 2001 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

FY 1997 budget authority exceeds the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178 as amended by P.L. 104-93. Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for FY 1997 would be subject to point of order under section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

#### OUTLAYS

FY 1997 outlays exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178 as amended by P.L. 104-93. Enactment of measures providing any new outlays for FY 1997 would be subject to point of order under section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

#### REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss in excess of \$20,534,000,000 for FY 1997 (if not already included in the current level estimate) or in excess of \$62,614,000,000 for FY 1997 through 2001 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to be less than the recommended levels of revenue set by H. Con. Res. 178.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a), REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1997

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1997			1997–2001		
	BA	Outlays	NEA	BA	Outlays	NEA
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	4,996
Current level .....	5	5	5	55	55	55
Difference .....	5	5	5	55	55	–4,941
National Security:						
Allocation .....	–1,579	–1,579	0	–664	–664	0
Current level .....	–102	–102	–21	–289	–289	–34
Difference .....	1,466	1,477	–21	375	375	–34
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Allocation .....	–128	–3,700	0	–711	–4,004	0
Current level .....	0	–6	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	128	3,694	0	711	4,004	0
Economic and Educational Opportunities:						
Allocation .....	–912	–800	–152	–3,465	–3,153	7,669
Current level .....	1,967	1,635	1,816	11,135	10,296	8,852
Difference .....	2,879	2,435	1,968	14,600	13,449	1,183
Commerce:						
Allocation .....	0	0	370	–14,540	–14,540	–41,710
Current level .....	3	3	492	242	195	1,430
Difference .....	3	3	122	14,782	14,735	43,140
International Relations:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Difference .....	–1	–1	0	–1	–1	0
Government Reform & Oversight:						
Allocation .....	–1,078	–1,078	–289	–4,605	–4,605	–1,668
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	1,078	1,078	289	4,605	4,605	1,668
House Oversight:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources:						
Allocation .....	–91	–90	–12	–1,401	–1,460	–59
Current level .....	–19	–20	0	–144	–167	0
Difference .....	72	70	12	1,257	1,293	59
Judiciary:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	–357	–357	0
Current level .....	3	3	0	45	45	0
Difference .....	3	3	0	402	402	0
Transportation & Infrastructure:						
Allocation .....	2,280	0	0	125,989	521	2
Current level .....	2,345	65	12	4,748	121	56
Difference .....	65	65	12	–121,241	–400	54
Science:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	–13	–13	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	13	13	0
Small Business:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation .....	–90	–90	224	–919	–919	3,475
Current level .....	0	0	3	0	0	–52
Difference .....	90	90	–221	919	919	–3,527
Ways and Means:						
Allocation .....	–8,973	–9,132	–2,057	–134,211	–134,618	–10,743
Current level .....	8,338	8,302	–2,840	73,457	73,476	–38,717
Difference .....	17,311	17,434	–783	207,668	208,094	–27,974
Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Authorized:						
Allocation .....	–10,571	–16,469	–1,916	–34,897	–163,812	–38,038
Current level .....	12,539	9,884	–533	89,248	83,731	–28,410
Difference .....	23,110	26,353	1,383	124,145	247,543	9,628

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 602(b) suballocations (Sept. 27, 1996)				Current level reflecting action completed as of Feb. 28, 1997				Difference			
	General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	12,960	13,380	0	0	13,009	13,373	0	0	49	–7	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State .....	24,493	24,493	4,525	2,951	24,838	25,065	4,526	2,954	345	126	1	3
Defense .....	245,065	243,372	0	0	243,851	242,887	0	0	–1,214	–485	0	0
District of Columbia .....	719	719	0	0	719	719	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy & Water Development .....	19,421	19,652	0	0	19,973	19,923	0	0	552	271	0	0
Foreign Operations .....	11,950	13,311	0	0	12,267	13,310	0	0	317	–1	0	0
Interior .....	12,118	12,920	0	0	12,503	13,178	0	0	385	258	0	0
Labor, HHS & Education .....	65,625	69,602	61	38	71,026	71,517	61	39	5,401	1,915	0	1
Legislative Branch .....	2,180	2,148	0	0	2,170	2,132	0	0	–10	–16	0	0
Military Construction .....	9,983	10,360	0	0	9,982	10,344	0	0	–1	–16	0	0
Transportation .....	12,190	35,453	0	0	12,080	35,519	0	0	–110	66	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service .....	11,016	10,971	97	84	11,620	11,292	97	83	604	321	0	–1
VA–HUD–Independent Agencies .....	64,354	78,803	0	0	64,522	79,196	0	0	168	393	0	0
Reserve/Offsets .....	768	219	0	0	–2,750	–5,850	0	0	–3,518	–6,069	0	0
Grand total .....	492,842	535,849	4,683	3,073	495,810	532,605	4,684	3,076	2,968	–3,244	1	3

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 1997.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of  
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1997. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1997 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 178) and are current through February 28, 1997. A summary of this tabulation follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 178)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget Authority .....	1,331,836	1,314,935	+16,901
Outlays .....	1,323,900	1,311,321	+12,579
Revenues:			
1997 .....	1,104,262	1,083,728	+20,534
1997-2001 .....	5,975,917	5,913,303	+62,614

Since my last report, dated January 9, 1997, the budget authority and outlay totals established in H. Con. Res. 178 have been revised to reflect additional appropriations that were enacted to pay for the costs of continuing disability reviews. This revision is in accordance with Section 103(b) of The Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-121). In addition, the Congress has cleared, and the President has signed, the Airport and Airway Trust Fund Tax Reinstatement Act of 1997 (H.R. 668). This action changed the current level of revenues.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—105TH CONGRESS,  
1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS  
FEBRUARY 28, 1997

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
PREVIOUSLY ENACTED			
Revenues .....			1,101,533
Permanents and other spending legislation .....	855,751	814,110	
Appropriation legislation .....	753,927	788,263	
Offsetting receipts .....	-271,843	-271,843	
Total previously enacted .....	1,337,835	1,330,530	1,101,533
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Airport and Airway Trust Fund Tax Reinstatement Act (H.R. 668) .....			2,730
APPROPRIATED ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs that have not been enacted .....	-5,999	-6,630	
TOTALS			
Total Current Level .....	1,331,836	1,323,900	1,104,262
Total Budget Resolution .....	1,314,935	1,311,321	1,083,728
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution .....			
Over Budget Resolution .....	16,901	12,579	20,534
ADDENDUM			
Emergencies:			
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement by the President and the Congress .....	1,806	1,228	
Funding that has been designated as an emergency requirement only by the Congress and is not available for obligation until requested by the President .....	323	305	
Total emergencies .....	2,129	1,533	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT—105TH CONGRESS,  
1ST SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS  
FEBRUARY 28, 1997—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total current level including emergencies .....	1,333,965	1,325,433	1,104,262

### JUSTICE AND EQUITY FOR FILIPINO VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, to introduce H.R. 836, the Filipino Veterans Equity Act.

Last year the Members of this House and our colleagues in the Senate took the first major step toward restoring fairness to this group of brave veterans. Both Chambers passed concurrent resolutions to recognize and thank the Filipino World War II veterans for their service and contributions toward the successful outcome of that war.

In October the President joined us and issued a Presidential proclamation recalling the courage, sacrifice and loyalty of these Filipino veterans of World War II and honored them for their contributions to our freedom. These actions were the first step. Now is the time to build upon that recognition that these veterans so deserve. Now is the time to restore the benefits that they were promised back in 1946.

Too few Americans are familiar with this chapter in our Nation's history. During World War II, the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines were drafted to serve in our Armed Forces by Executive order of the President of the United States. Filipino soldiers defended the American flag in the now famous battles of Bataan and Corregidor. Thousands of Filipino prisoners of war died during the 65-mile Bataan death march. Those who survived were imprisoned under inhuman conditions where they suffered casualties at the rate of 50 to 200 prisoners per day. They endured 4 long years of enemy occupation.

The soldiers who escaped capture, together with Filipino civilians, fought against the occupation forces. Their guerrilla attacks foiled the plans of the Japanese for a quick takeover of the region and allowed the United States the time needed to prepare forces to defeat Japan. After the liberation of the Philippine Islands, the United States was able to use the strategically located Commonwealth of the Philippines as a base from which to launch the final efforts to win the war.

With their vital participation so crucial to the outcome of World War II, one would assume that the United

States would be grateful to their Filipino comrades. So it is hard to believe that soon after the war ended, the 79th Congress voted in a way that only can be considered blatant discrimination, as they took away the benefits and recognition that the Filipino World War II veterans were promised in what was called the Rescissions Act of 1946.

Now over 50 years have passed since this Rescissions Act, 50 long years during which the Filipino veterans have been waiting for justice. I am so proud that Congress and the President have taken the first step to restoring their dignity. The Filipino veterans, and sons, their daughters are most grateful for the recognition and honor bestowed upon them last year.

But now is the time to complete the job. Now is the time to correct the injustices of the 79th Congress. Many of these Filipino veterans have already died, and in a decade or decade and a half there will no longer be any of these veterans still living. They have been patiently waiting and asking: Do we deserve that Rescissions Act of 1946? Did we not fight side by side with the forces from the United States? Have we not suffered the same suffering as the American soldier during that war? Did bullets ask if their target was an American or Filipino soldier?

The bill that we have introduced this week, H.R. 836, will provide full benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans who served in the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Special Philippine Scouts. During the last session of Congress, over 100 Members of the House signed up as cosponsors of an identical bill.

Now is the time for all of us to join together in a bipartisan effort to correct a monumental injustice by restoring benefits promised to the Filipino World War II veterans for their defense of Democratic ideals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MANZULLO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

### IT IS TIME TO PASS TAX RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAPPAS. As the old saying goes, Mr. Speaker, there are two certainties in life: death and taxes. While we can only die once, every year Americans

are working harder and longer to pay their taxes. For many Americans the current tax system is in effect a death sentence.

Who among us thinks that we are undertaxed? How many of us think that we should be paying more of our hard-earned tax dollars to the Federal Government? We are taxed on every dime we make, every purchase we make, every phone call we place, every gallon of gas we pump, every home we sell. We are even taxed when we die. The people of central New Jersey have told me that they are tired of paying more and more each year. They have told me to go to Washington and work for real tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, the time that is spent to pay the tax bill is time that could be better spent. It is time that a mother or father could be spending with their child. It is a time that a small business man or woman could be drumming up new customers. Imagine that you found a new job where you were told to come to work at 9 in the morning but you would not start getting paid until 11:45. Would you want that job? Yet that is the part of every day that every average American worker spends to pay their taxes. It was not until May 7 last year that the average American worker was able to stop working for Uncle Sam.

I have made it a top priority of mine to help ease the burden of taxes on the individuals, families and businesses of this country. On my first day as a Member of Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 245, that will ease the burden for those families or individuals trying to sell their house or buy new equipment for a small business.

□ 1215

The legislation reduces the capital gains tax by 50 percent and seeks to eventually end it entirely.

H.R. 245 also aims at keeping family owned businesses and farms in the family. It raises the estate tax exemption so that a son or daughter can build on a business that was started by their mother or father. This obtrusive death tax brings in only a small amount of revenue into the Government and, yet, can have devastating effects on a family or a family business.

Oftentimes a business or farm that has been part of a family for generations is forced to be sold just to pay the tax bill. Approximately 75 percent of businesses in this country are family owned and 78 percent of the founders of those businesses intend to pass their business down to their children, but currently only 30 percent of businesses ever make it to a second generation.

Many parents work their entire life to hand down something to their children to make their lives better. Under the current system, the Government steps in and destroys a lifetime of work. That is wrong, and for many it will end with the passage of H.R. 245.

Just yesterday I, along with the chairman of the Committee on Small

Business, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT], introduced another piece of legislation, H.R. 955, that will help to keep the entrepreneurial spirit of this country alive.

The Family Freedom Home Office Deduction Act of 1997 will make it easier for the 14,000,000 home-based business owners to deduct the expenses of their home office. Small businesses are the single greatest creators of jobs in this country and, frankly, in the future. The advent of fax machines, Internet and teleconferencing have changed the face of business. No longer are businesses confined to large office buildings.

More and more people are working out of their homes. Each of us knows people in our district who work from their homes: consultants, salespeople, lawyers, doctors, accountants. Many of the people that we deal with each day, sometimes unbeknownst to us, are working out of their home. Whether it is the father who wants to be there for his children or the mother who works as a consultant, working from home has become increasingly appealing. Seventy percent of all home-based businesses are started by women. The Tax Code should reflect the modern business environment of our country.

America has always been the home of the entrepreneur. This legislation is one step in equipping small businesses with the tools it needs to continue being the fastest growing sector and job producers in our economy.

Providing every American with tax relief is not a partisan issue. Our job here in Congress is to represent the people of America and work to make their lives better. Passing tax relief is good for our future and the time to act is now.

#### WEST VIRGINIA TO RECEIVE FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there are times to say thank you, and as the flood waters are receding but not gone from West Virginia, it is time to say thank you to the National Guard, the hundreds of men and women who have been on duty for many, many days. It is time to say thank you to the emergency services personnel, the State and county office of emergency services, the volunteer fire departments all across our State. The many volunteers, the Red Cross and the Salvation Army.

We are still pulling out the mud, still feeding people in shelters, still trying to clean out homes, still trying to clean off roads, and that work is going to go on for a long time, but a lot of people have made the loss of life minimal and have safeguarded much life and properties because of their efforts. So to these people we owe a great deal of thanks.

Governor Underwood has done an excellent job coordinating all these different resources, and as we finish the first stage in our State in flood recovery, we now enter the second stage. That second stage begins today with the Governor requesting Federal disaster assistance for a number of our counties. In seeking partial declaration of Federal assistance, Cabell, Kanawha, Wirt, and Wetzel Counties would be the first ones under a partial declaration. And it must be pointed out that this is a partial declaration; that because the flood waters are still receding in some areas, we do not know the full amount of damage in those areas and it will take a day or two more to assess that.

But other counties will be added to the disaster declaration made by the Federal Government. I can assure people of that, having personally contacted the Federal Emergency Management Agency myself, having met with the Vice President and the head of FEMA yesterday in Huntington, having sent a letter directly to the President of the United States, as well as the head of FEMA, having been in close contact with Governor Underwood, the OES staff and, of course, the Federal officials.

The partial declaration will name some counties and then others will be added very, very quickly. No one should be worried that they will be left out in this regard. Simply because a county is not named does not mean it will not be under the Federal disaster declaration. Indeed, it will probably follow in the next couple of days.

When the county is named, the people in that county, Mr. Speaker, will have access to a toll free number and they can call that number, which goes directly to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and then they can start beginning to receive the assistance they need and applying for the assistance they need in housing, in unemployment, crisis counseling, tax relief, small business loans and the many other areas that are so necessary to help the thousands of West Virginians get back on their feet.

We have had 9,000 residences affected by this flood, Mr. Speaker, and the damage is beyond comprehension.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important also to emphasize that as the first stage begins to end, and as the National Guard and others begin to return to their normal duties, now the second stage begins, and that is the Federal assistance, and there will be others there to assist as well. My staff will be visiting many of these areas. I will, of course, be working closely with the Governor's staff and others. So no one will be left alone.

Switching topics, Mr. Speaker, turning to the eastern panhandle for a second, the eastern panhandle on Monday is going to host the first of a series called Project Europe Forums. I am delighted the men and women of the eastern panhandle have taken this on.

Heading up Project Europe in the steering committee, I know how much

we can gain in West Virginia from marketing our goods in the European Union. So on Monday, in Martinsburg, at the Holiday Inn, we will be holding the first of Project Europe functions in which we bring together representatives of the German Embassy, the United States Department of Commerce, the West Virginia Development Office and other West Virginia businesses that have already cracked the European market and to work with our other West Virginia businesses that maybe want to increase their opportunities or indeed want to get into the European market for the first time.

Seventy-five percent of foreign investment in West Virginia is European. Over a billion dollars worth of goods sold from West Virginia goes to the European Union. So I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be a valuable undertaking, and I am delighted the eastern panhandle, and Martinsburg in particular, will host our first Project Europe seminar on Monday.

#### SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of comprehensive tax reform. My personal belief is that we should completely scrap the current Tax Code and replace it with one that is fairer, flatter and simpler. While I am not certain of which tax reform proposal is best for our country, I am certain that our current system is desperately in need of reform.

April 15, millions of Americans will struggle with the current Tax Code in a desperate attempt to comply with the rules and regulations and their obligation to this country. Since enactment, the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, the income tax code has grown from 744,000 words in 1955 to 5,577,000 words in 1994. This represents a growth rate of 625 percent for that 40-year period.

The Code has been revised well over 400 times through major tax enactments and public laws. The Tax Code has become so overly complicated that the average American taxpayer finds it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to comply.

I understand that major reform does not come about overnight and there are significant steps we can take in the interim to help ease the tax burden for the hard working men and women of this country. The first is a reduction of the capital gains tax. The capital gains tax represents a significant disincentive for investment in this country and stifles economic growth. Its reduction would help unlock stagnant investment and allow our economy to thrive.

Second, I would like to eliminate altogether the estate tax. The death tax, as it is called, is one of the worst provisions in the Tax Code. This tax penalizes hard working families who work so

hard to provide financial security to their children and grandchildren. It often forces businesses and business owners, farmers as well, to liquidate their businesses just to pay this tax.

If Congress is serious about easing the tax burden and making our tax system more equitable, capital gains and estate taxes are a good place to start.

#### OUR COUNTRY NEEDS SWEEPING TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe the most compassionate and practical thing that this Congress can do is to give the American people tax laws that make sense and tax relief that is meaningful. Our country desperately needs sweeping tax reform. Our people need tax laws they can understand. They need a method of taxation that is fair and reasonable.

Our tax laws now are so complicated that even the IRS cannot explain them. I think it is ludicrous the IRS sends out 8 billion pages of forms and instructions each year. Our tax system is too complicated, and our taxes are simply too high.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the growing number of congressional Members calling for sweeping tax reform and meaningful tax relief.

We lost the fight this year to give the American people the term limits the majority said they wanted, and it appears from this week that we may be losing the fight to give the American people the balanced budget amendment that they have been wanting and feel they can build their future on. But let us not lose this fight. Let the 105th Congress be remembered for slaying the dragon that terrorized previous Congresses.

I have been a long-time advocate of the flat tax. I support the Freedom and Fairness Restoration Act of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. A flat tax is simple. I like Mr. ARMEY's suggestion that Americans ought to be able to file their taxes on a form the size of a postcard.

A flat tax treats everyone equally and fairly. It will spur the economy and encourage people to save and invest. The Freedom and Fairness Restoration Act will also give Americans desperately needed tax relief, providing a reasonable tax cut while raising nearly as much money as the current system. But more than this, I think a flat tax can reform our entire political system.

Congress has used the American Tax Code as a tool for social engineering, and that is not right. Behaviors are rewarded or punished through a little tinkering here and a little tinkering there of the Tax Code. I believe that is a cynical and improper use of our power. Americans pay taxes to support a government created to serve them,

not to a government created to control them.

Mr. Speaker, we never enjoy paying our taxes. The millions of American families struggling to make ends meet will never be eager to give their precious dollars to the Federal Government. But if we have the courage to act, these families can say for the first time that they now understand the tax laws that they are obeying. They can say for the first time that they know their tax burden is not heavier for them than for the family down the street or those across town. They can say for the first time that the American tax system is simple, fair, and just.

#### DEATH TAX IS PARTICULARLY METTLESOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Tax Code hurts our economy. We all know that Americans who try to save get penalized and that most Americans need a tax attorney to help them file their returns.

I want to speak briefly, however, on a part of the Tax Code that is particularly mettlesome to constituents in my district: The death tax, which was first enacted in 1916 on estates larger than \$50,000, which in today's dollars would be about \$720,000 at a top tax rate of 10 percent.

Today, under the tax and spend policies of the past, this tax has grown to include estates valued as low as \$600,000 with a top tax rate of 55 percent.

The goal of this tax is to prevent families from amassing huge estates and to promote wealth redistribution. That may sound like a good goal on paper, but in practice this tax does not have that effect. In fact, the estate tax hurts middle class, family owned businesses and farms by making it harder for the business to be passed on to the next generation.

Back in my district, in Illinois, the Buesinger family, from Christian County, have recently found out how terrible this tax can be.

□ 1230

After Glen Buesinger, Sr. passed away, his three sons and wife were left to manage the farm. The family almost lost their farm and is still hurting from the costs, aggravation, and frustration this tax has placed on them.

The rich in this country, at which this law is aimed, simply evade this tax legally by using complex estate planning techniques and tricky lawyers. Since many of these techniques are costly and require long lead times to implement, those with the largest estates have the greatest ability to engage in this practice. A disproportionate burden of the death tax falls on those with recently acquired assets, such as farmers and small business owners.

Imagine, if you will, owning a family farm in southwestern Illinois which you have worked for 30 years. You have built and developed the land with the hope of passing it along to your children so that they may have a better life. But after your death, your children tragically find that the farm will not be staying in the family. In fact, most of the farm must be sold off to pay the Federal taxes due on the property.

This tax costs Americans a great deal back in Illinois but the sacrifice shows up for very little in Washington tax coffers. According to the Office of Management and Budget, the estate tax raises little more than 1 percent of the total Federal revenues. In addition, costs to the Government to collect this tax can be as high as 65 cents of every dollar.

Mr. Speaker, this tax policy is not an effective way to help America create jobs and grow the economy. This policy taxes the middle class and destroys the dreams of countless families. It is time we abolish this tax and start letting Americans know that their dreams can come true and not end up in the hands of some big-spending bureaucrats in Washington.

#### TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYUN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYUN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is taking too much of the American taxpayer's money. As the representative from the Second District of Kansas, I have been elected to be a custodian of their money and I am here to make a report that their taxes are too high.

Right now Americans, and Kansans in particular, pay more in taxes than they do on three essential things: food, shelter, and clothing. All of those things combined, they pay more taxes. They have to work until May 7 before they can realize even one penny of their hard-earned money. That means that January, February, March, April, and the first 7 days of May, they have to work to support the Federal Government before they can realize even one penny of their hard-earned money.

In 1992, families were promised a tax cut, only to have that promise broken and to see the largest tax increase in American history. I along with others have personally felt this tax increase. As a small independent businessman, there were times as I finished collecting and putting together the payroll that I would come up and I would say to my family, I would show them in fact what I earned, say, 10 years before and what I earned last year and I would show them that the difference was taxation. It is too large, it is too much, and we need to make a change.

Some people do not understand that, though. They think that the Government is entitled to every penny that

they earn. They need to realize and here is an opportunity to realize that it is their hard-earned money, it is not the Federal Government's money.

Recently I was in Pittsburg, KS, seeing some of my constituents, and as I was leaving, traveling to another southeast Kansas city, I was stopped on the highway by a construction worker as I was waiting for construction to be completed. The young man that was holding the sign came back to me, and as we talked at the window I began enlisting him hopefully in support of my campaign to elect me to the Second District of Kansas. I handed him one of my fliers and he responded by saying, "I'm not involved in the process, I don't vote." And so as we continued to talk, he began explaining to me that he did not want to be a construction worker the rest of his life but that he would like to be an underwater welder like his uncle and earn lots of money. I then reached over to the side of my car where my wife normally sat and gave him a voter registration, and I explained to him that when he started earning more money and started paying taxes like the rest of us, he would want to be involved in this process and have more say-so as to how his taxes were being spent.

Specifically, I think we need to help Kansas families, Kansas working families, and there are four areas. One of them is in the area of the marriage penalty. We need to eliminate that. Another area is in terms of capital gains. We need to reduce capital gains. By reducing capital gains, we will free up more money, we will provide for better jobs and we will provide more opportunities for hard-working Kansas family members. We need to reward Kansas families. The \$500 per child tax credit would be an opportunity to do that. Finally, we need to eliminate the estate, or I would like to say the death tax. When you have been taxed all of your life, there is nothing worse than one more insult from the Federal Government.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to work hard with other freshmen, my freshman colleagues and other Members from both sides of the aisle who are willing to reduce the level of taxation on families. We need to restore back to the American public the opportunity to see more of their hard-earned and realized dollars.

#### THE MOST UNFAIR TAX, CAPITAL GAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to stand and speak out against the tax that I think is the most unfair tax in this country, the capital gains tax. This is a tax that has been debated for a decade in this country and it has been debated and has not been cut because, in

my view, those who oppose cutting this tax say that it would be a tax break for the rich. And who wants to give the rich a tax break? None of us.

But that is not a fair statement. When you look at the record, 37 percent of the people who pay the capital gains tax make less than \$30,000 in income a year. Is that the rich? Fifty-seven percent make less than \$50,000 a year. Is that the rich? Seventy-four percent make less than \$75,000 a year. Is that the rich? Who does it really affect? I think one of the most detrimental effects is on our farmers, our restaurateurs, our merchants, small manufacturers, small investors, and many of our senior citizens.

I want to give Members an iron-clad example. If a couple bought a farm in 1957 for \$40,000 and they just maintained that farm until today and sold it, it would probably bring about \$400,000, only because of inflation, not because it is of more value, just keeping equal. That couple would pay \$111,000 of that money back to the Federal Government who has done nothing to help them, only tax them, for all of that time. Is that fair? I do not think so.

Most farmers and small businesspeople do not have savings plans and do not have retirement systems. They depend on the value of their farm and their small business when they sell it as a nest egg to augment their Social Security.

Yes, the capital gains tax taxes inflation as it did with that farmer. Who taxes capital gains? The growing countries of the world, Hong Kong, the Netherlands, Germany, and Japan, do not. They do not tax capital gains. Other countries index assets for inflation so that you do not pay on a false growth. Inflation is not a growth in value.

The record is clear. In 1978 through 1985 when we cut our capital gains tax in this country 30 percent, from 50 to 20, revenues actually increased from \$9 billion a year to \$26.5 billion. In 1986 when we increased it from 20 percent back to 28 percent, 6 years later revenues were just equal. It did not grow. We did not benefit.

The 28 percent capital gains tax rate has locked up trillions of dollars of needed capital to reinvest in our sluggish rural economy in America. Too much of rural America is struggling to provide opportunities for our young people. It is certainly obvious to me that a capital gains tax cut is not a tax cut for the rich. It is for our family farmers. It is for the local merchants, small manufacturers, our neighbors who have invested in a business or in stocks, and many of our senior citizens who would like to sell their business and be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

I call upon my colleagues today to make our No. 1 priority cutting and initially eliminating the capital gains tax, because it is the greatest deterrent to economic growth and a future for

our young people that we have in this country today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have gone before me and addressed an issue which I think is of great importance to the future of our country. In fact if you look back in 1948, the average tax burden in America on the average family was about 2 percent of their income. Today the Federal tax burden is 24 percent and when we factor in State and local taxes, it gets upward of 40 percent. And if you figure the overall cost of government to the American family today, it is over 50 percent of their income.

If you look at some of the statistics that were released by the Kemp Commission last year, the fact is that we spend in this country over 5 billion man-hours a year filling out tax returns. You think about the number of people who do nothing. Three million full-time equivalent people who do nothing but fill out tax returns. I think it is ironic because that is more people than we have in our entire Armed Forces in America. That tells me one thing; that we spend more time, money, and energy in resources defending ourselves from our own tax system than we do from foreign enemies. So we have a tax system in this country that is desperately in need of overhaul, of simplification, of common sense for American families and businesses.

I would also point out that there are 471 different tax forms. I think the complexity of our Tax Code today was illustrated recently when the Internal Revenue Service expended \$4 billion to come up with a computer system to process it which they discovered could not work. And so we need to simplify the Tax Code in this country in a way that makes sense for American families and American businesses and lowers the overall tax burden for our families.

One of the things that I think you will find in this town in particular is a lot of institutional resistance to that. It is ironic as well, as I was reading some time back in the Wall Street Journal, an op-ed piece which suggested that in 1964 there were some 16,000 lobbyists in Washington and today there are over 64,000 lobbyists, which is 125 for every Member of Congress. There is nothing wrong with lobbying and many of us rely on the information that they provide to us, but I

think it points to the fact that government has become so inordinately complex that it takes people to interpret the laws and try and tell us and try and tell the American people what they mean. In fact lobbying, according to the article, today is an \$8 billion industry which is larger than 57 economies in the world.

The other point I would make in terms of the complexity of the Tax Code, I was also reading last year in the Wall Street Journal a story about the number of people in tax writing committees of the Congress who actually fill out their own tax returns and of the 57, I think the article stated that there were 6 who confirmed that they in fact did that. I suspect that is probably because again of the complexity of the Tax Code.

And so as we look at this priority in this next session of our Congress and as we embark upon many of the things that we have laid out in terms of things that we want to accomplish and the goals, there are a number of us, many of my colleagues in the freshman class who are here today to speak to this issue, who in the course of their campaigns talked about what we can do to come up with a Tax Code that is simple, that is fair, that lowers the overall tax burden on American businesses and families.

I too would issue the call today upon my colleagues in the Congress to make this a priority, so that in this session of Congress we do something that we have lacked the courage, the will before to do, and that is to address this behemoth Tax Code which clearly has gotten out of control.

And I think that the people of this country, the men and women who fill out tax returns every day, those who are in business, those who are creating jobs and creating wealth, it was just alluded to earlier by my colleague from Pennsylvania, the enormous cost of capital in this country and how that compares with other industrialized nations in the world. And we do tax capital at a high rate and we tax labor at a high rate.

I was reading recently as well that if you look at the number of people who file tax returns in America, 72 percent spend more on payroll tax than they do on income tax. And so we need to do something to allow the economic engine in America to continue to move our country forward, to create new jobs and make our economy all that it can be. I do not believe that we will see that happen if we continue to be bogged down and mired in this complex web that we know today as our U.S. Tax Code.

And so along with my colleagues who have spoken before me and those who will follow, I today as well would ask that we make this a priority for the 105th Congress, that we be the Congress that is known and that our legacy be that we simplified and made sense of the American Tax Code.

□ 1245

#### IT IS TIME TO REPEAL THE ESTATE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address an issue today that is very important to me and, in particular, to America's small family farms and businesses, the repeal of the estate tax or, as many like to refer to it, the death tax.

Yesterday I met with Mr. and Mrs. Mouskondis, the owners of Nicholas & Co., a family-owned and operated food distributing company in my home State of Utah. About 40 years ago, Mr. Mouskondis' father passed on his business to his son Bill. While a small company at the time, Nicholas & Co. today is steadily expanding and diversifying, and Bill now works with more than 250 employees and is constantly working to improve his company by using new technology and streamlining his service.

Yet in order to prepare to pay the estate tax, Bill is facing steep costs and may have to sell off assets or, worse yet, release employees. This is something Bill has not done since he became the owner of the company.

When the owner of a family business or farm dies, the value of the enterprise is added to the owner's estate and is taxed after exemptions. While the owner of this business has spent his entire life working hard to contribute to society, provide for his family and to establish his own American dream, in the end his family must endure the loss of him and cover the cost of his commendable life's efforts.

Not only is the tax a burden, the rates currently run between 37 and 55 percent, but the costs involved in dealing with this tax are exorbitant as well. The average family business spends \$20,000 in legal fees, \$11,900 for accounting fees, and \$11,200 for other advisers just to pay the taxes.

But dollars do not tell the real story. Family businesses are exactly that, businesses for families. But the Small Business Administration reports that a full 33 percent of grieving relatives must sell all or part of the family business to pay the estate tax.

Is it any wonder why only 30 percent of family businesses are passed on to the second generation?

This is simply wrong, wrong because America was founded and its government established to protect the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of each American citizen. We here in Washington are not fulfilling our duties when we penalize Americans for working hard.

It is time to repeal the estate tax. I encourage each of you to support H.R. 902, the Cox-Kyl Family Heritage Preservation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### WE MUST CONTINUE TO PUSH FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BOB SCHAFFER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to speak on the topic of excessive taxation.

Tuesday of this week the first attempt of the 105th Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment fell short by only one pathetic vote. The failure to pass this amendment was of great disappointment not only to me and my family but to most Members of Congress and to approximately 80 percent of the American people who have repeatedly and consistently asked Congress to protect the futures of their children by the passage of a balanced budget amendment.

Now yesterday's setback is temporary, I assure you of that. We must and we will continue to push for a balanced budget amendment for the American taxpayer. But for now it is essential that we remember just whose hard-earned dollars provide for the budget, the same budget that we hope will one day be balanced. It is the retired school teacher in Cincinnati OH, small businessmen in Atlanta, GA or, closer to my home, the farmer in Lamar, CO. They are the ones who sacrifice a greater and growing portion of their strenuous effort, hard work and time away from their families in order to pay more and more cash only to be squandered here in Washington, DC, year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we focused on strategies to allow these honest, hard-working producers to keep more of what they earn for themselves and for their families. They deserve a break from excessive and punitive taxation such as the capital gains tax and the inheritance tax. Mr. Speaker, these taxes do nothing more than betray the very characteristics that Americans stand for: accomplishment, success, honesty, opportunity, and optimism, but most especially responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, these are the core American values upon which our budget and Tax Code should be built, not the waste, duplicity, despair and stupidity that our Government heaps upon taxpayers every day.

Now, since the President and his party seem to have the upper hand in their zeal to kill a balanced budget, let us agree at least that the dead hand of capital gains taxes and the tax on inheritance be lifted from the worn backs of American families. Let us free the productive instincts of a Nation,

unleash its creativity and competitiveness, restore the value of thrift, and preserve families and their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am just a new Member of Congress, but the people of Colorado did not send me here to make friends with the alligators. They expect me to help drain the swamp, and providing relief from capital gains taxes and death taxes are two important ways to help Americans rise above the muck and mire of oppressive taxation. On this topic I intend to be most persistent and to speak here often.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROHRABACHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TAX-FREE INTERNET ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that I should rise now, the Representative from the home State of the alligator, to address a particular area of our economy that I would like to set aside as not eligible for taxation, and that is the Internet.

Specifically, I have filed a bill today entitled the Tax-Free Internet Act of 1997. This legislation amends the Internal Revenue Code to declare that fees for Internet access and other online services are not and shall not be subject to Federal taxation. Furthermore, the bill would prevent any Federal department from using its funds to study the revenue potential of Internet taxation. I believe that this legislation is a strong statement in support of the free and unfettered development of this industry. My bill has already been endorsed by several online services and Internet service providers.

America Online, one of the Nation's most widely used Internet-related service providers, said, and I quote, "We commend your leadership in authoring and sponsoring the Tax-Free Internet Act of 1997. AOL strongly supports your policy efforts. Any new tax could threaten the continued growth of this global medium."

The President of Erol's online service adds, "This legislation is a very positive development, and I give it my full support."

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow this budding industry to be smothered by Federal taxation. A few of the States, including my own State of Florida, have already initiated legislation to exempt the Internet and online service access fees from State and local taxes. We on the Federal level should do likewise.

As the United States Internet Providers Association says of my bill: "We support the efforts of all informed policymakers to protect technology inno-

vation and the growth of the industry through sound legislation. This is a step in the right direction."

Mr. Speaker, let us here resolve not to interfere with the technological phenomenon which has done so much to inform and educate so many millions of Americans. Let us restrain the reach of government so as not to smother the vitality and creativity that characterize this new frontier in communications.

#### PATENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about something that really is pure Americana. It is important enough that it is noted in the U.S. Constitution. I refer to the U.S. patent which is the backbone of the United States economy, the basis for our dominant place in the world economy, and clearly the key to a more prosperous economic future. Invention is certainly pure Americana.

As I have said, by offering the strongest patent protections in the world the United States has stimulated more creativity, more new industries and tens of millions of more new jobs than anywhere else in the world throughout all of our history. Yet the small independent inventors, the future Graham Bells, the Edisons, the Henry Fords, are now having to fight tooth and nail to maintain their constitutional right to their intellectual property. It is slowly, slowly being stolen out from them by the mega corporations and foreign interests. Truly, intellectual property in the United States is under dire threat. The system we have in place may not be perfect, but at least the small independent inventor has a fighting chance against the larger multinational corporations.

A perfect illustration, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of saving our patent system is the very true story of Dr. Raymond Damadian of Long Island and the inventor of the MRI. It has taken Dr. Damadian, who is a physician at the Down State Medical Center in Brooklyn, some 25 years to uphold the patent he received back in 1970, and that is with the protections of the U.S. Constitution. In June 1970, Dr. Damadian discovered the different types of tissues taken from rats emit different signals when placed in a nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer. Not only that, but cancerous tissues taken from the rats emit significantly different NMR signals. It immediately occurred to Dr. Damadian that if it were possible to create a large enough and powerful enough scanner to contain a human, it would be possible to detect cancer very early on.

Less than 2 years later, Dr. Damadian filed the pioneer patent application that really was the world's first MRI, a patent application that

came from Dr. Damadian right from Long Island. Two years later, back in 1974, he received that patent from the U.S. Patent Office in Washington. By July 1977, Dr. Damadian and his assistants achieved the world's first whole body human MRI image. In March 1978, Dr. Damadian formed a company called FONAR and began to develop and market MRI scanners and, within 2 years, unveiled the world's first commercial MRI scanner.

The problem Dr. Damadian encountered was not really from the U.S. Patent Office, but in fact it was a failure by them to enforce his ownership of that patent. Eleven years after Dr. Damadian unveiled the world's first commercial MRI, his patent became infringed upon by several international corporations including Johnson & Johnson, General Electric, and Hitachi. For those who do not know, I mean by infringement that Dr. Damadian's patent technology for the MRI, the intellectual property that he owned, was basically copied by these large corporations.

Well, 25 years later, after literally millions of dollars in legal expenses, Dr. Damadian has finally won his day in court. He was judged by the courts to in fact be the rightful owner of the patent for the MRI. FONAR, a Long Island corporation, could today be clearly a corporation that would have retained and employed tens of thousands of Long Islanders were it not for the 25 years of legal maneuvers that kept Dr. Damadian tied up in court.

Mr. Speaker, again I think it is important to understand that the U.S. patent is really pure Americana. It is at the heart of American ingenuity and our ability, frankly, to remain No. 1 in the global marketplace. But afoot here in the Congress is something that has been evolving over the last several years, and that is to harmonize patents, to take American ingenuity and harmonize it to the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this chance to talk about the MRI and Dr. Damadian's important contributions.

□ 1300

#### AMERICA MUST REENERGIZE ITSELF IN FIGHTING THE WAR AGAINST ILLEGAL DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address a matter of the greatest public concern. Illegal drug abuse is soaring in our country, and it is the most serious social problem that faces our communities, our families, and our children. We hear this from every side. It is our children themselves who are telling us this. Thirty-five percent of teenagers ages 13 through 17 identified drugs as their most serious concern.

Our law enforcement agents are telling us this as well. Thirty-one percent of the Nation's police chiefs believe that the best way to reduce violent crime is to reduce drug abuse. Drug-related activities have been identified as being at the core of the violent crimes, the property crimes, and, yes, domestic abuse which afflict our communities.

During the 1980's our Nation declared a war against drugs. I was in that battle as a Federal prosecutor. It was during that time that our families, our communities, and our law enforcement officials mobilized in a united effort to fight this war. Because of this national crusade, teenage drug abuse declined from 1985 to 1992.

Then what happened? It was then that our national commitment against this war of drugs waned. It was then that teenage drug use again started to increase, and we saw that teenage experimentation with drugs was on the incline.

Today it is my belief that we need to renew our national commitment to saving our children, to restoring the vibrancy of our inner cities, and strengthening our families. How do we do this? By reenergizing ourselves in this war on drugs. We must not retreat. It is not the time. We must not be satisfied to hide in the foxhole. It is imperative that we fight on.

It is particularly timely today that we reenergize our country because last week the administration released its report on our Nation's drug control strategy. In that report, the administration criticized the war against drugs, and said the term war against drugs was misleading. The administration preferred to adopt the language of pessimism, and say that we should more appropriately use the term cancer. To me the implication of using the word cancer in relation to our drug problems is that it implies that it is going to be with us a long time, and we simply must learn to live with it.

I believe it is a war that we must fight, and not a problem that we must learn to accept and deal with. It is the wrong message when we change the terminology. It is the wrong message to our teens, who deal in symbols and listen to the nuances of language as to whether it is a serious national problem or it is something that is acceptable in our society. It is the wrong message to send with our families, who are struggling day in and day out, and as the parent of teenagers, I understand this. They face daily the corrosive effects of drug abuse. And it is the wrong message to our law enforcement officers who daily place their lives on the line in this struggle.

In signaling a retreat from the war on drugs, we also undermine the efforts of other nations, which are looking to the United States of America for leadership. The other nations are putting the lifeblood of their leaders, in many cases, and soldiers out on the front line in an effort to stop drug production and trafficking within their own borders.

While the administration says we should not call this a war, it refused to certify certain countries for not fighting hard enough, not fighting hard enough to stop the flow of illegal drugs into America. I applaud the administration for not certifying certain countries, but our country must lead in this battle. We must not change the terminology. We must call it a war, because it is a war for our families, it is a war for our children, it is a war for our streets and our inner cities, and it is a war that we must win.

In Mexico alone, 40 drug agents were killed fighting the importation of drugs into the United States of America to satisfy the demand we see in our country. We must provide leadership to Mexico. We must provide leadership to South America. We must call it a war, because it is a war in which people's lives are being lost, not just in America, but also in other countries.

So it is my hope that this administration will reengage itself in the war against drugs, that this Congress will reenergize itself, that we will provide leadership to our American families, to our teenagers, and to set the appropriate example. I pledge that support as a Member of this body.

#### WE SHOULD VALUE AND CHERISH OUR NATION'S IMMIGRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an all too familiar debate in our country, immigration and immigrants. This is an age-old topic that has taken many different faces since the founding of this Nation. Today the immigration debate seems to be focused on mostly Latino and Asian-American immigrants, or individuals from the Caribbean or African nations, people of color.

However, I am concerned that the immigration issue is too often raised in a negative manner. Why is it that we cannot talk about immigrants without mentioning the undocumented, those who may not have complied with all of the rules and regulations? The politicizing of the immigration issues and programs like Citizenship U.S.A. made by certain groups have attempted to demonize immigrants.

I submit that certain groups have been using immigrants as a scapegoat for years. Oftentimes they have been marginalized in the great divide between black and white. As illustrated in the words of W.E.B. DuBois, he pointed out that mass immigration hurt both black and white laborers, as he foreshadowed future events by noting the Republican Party platform of 1864, which advocated increased immigration in the interests of big business:

A new flood of eager-to-work immigrant labor was brought into the country to work

on the railroads and in the new industries. Northern mill owners, who had feared free farms because they might decrease the number of laborers and raise their wages, were appeased by the promotion of alien immigration. It was interesting to hear the Union Party, as the Republicans called themselves in 1864, say in their platform: "Foreign immigration, which in the past had added so much to the wealth and development of resources and the increase of power to this Nation—the aspirations of the oppressed of all nations should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy." That year the Bureau of Immigration was created. . . . In 1860 immigrants were coming in at a rate of 130,000 a year but the new homestead laws began to attract them, so after the war immigration quickly rose . . . and in 1873 had reached 460,000 annually.

I feel it is important to address the issue of stereotyping our Nation's immigrants because it is unjust, it is unfair, and it is wrong. I would like people to think of the many contributions that immigrants have made. We should value and cherish immigrants. Everyone in this country, except for native Americans, are immigrants. Some came voluntarily and others, like myself, came involuntarily.

It is my hope that the next time immigration is brought up as a topic, that it conjures up a positive image in our mind, one that values the mosaic background and cultures that make up the Nation as well as the district where I live, represent, and work.

I enjoy experiencing the sights, sounds, and smells of Caribbean restaurants on Georgia Avenue, and Ethiopian cuisine in Adams Morgan. Closer to home, I also enjoy Little Italy, on Taylor street, Chinatown, at Wentworth and Surmack, Little Village in Franklin Park.

The top 10 immigrant groups that boast the great land of Lincoln as their home are a diverse group. They are from Mexico, Poland, Philippines, Germany, India, Italy, Korea, the United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Greece, Africa, all over the world. By no means do I view them as a threat. I think they are, indeed, a great asset.

That is why it disturbs me that the INS Citizenship U.S.A. Program is in the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. I feel it is offensive to all Americans to question the integrity and loyalty and contributions of immigrants.

This is not the first time. During World War II, Japanese-Americans and their children were rounded up and placed into internment camps. They were placed in these camps because the American Government viewed these Americans of Japanese descent as a threat to national security.

Imagine how they must have felt to be viewed as a threat to their own country. Many of those Japanese-Americans interned were actually born here. In spite of this insult, Japanese-Americans formed a special regimental combat team, which was one of the most decorated units of its size in World War II.

It should also be noted that a United States Government commission later concluded, and I quote: "Not a single documented act of espionage, sabotage, or fifth column activity was committed by an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, or by a resident Japanese alien."

This is just one fine example of the many various contributions that immigrants have made. I question the accusation that immigrants do not share the same commitment to the United States.

According to a recent study released by the Cato Institute called "In Defense of a Nation" on the military contributions of immigrants,

The military contributions of immigrants is a story that has gone largely untold. Today, 62,560 immigrants serve on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. More than 20 percent of the recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor in United States have been immigrants. Immigrant scientists and engineers are major developers of advanced U.S. Government laboratories and major defense firms. In fact, the submarine, the helicopter, a more advanced ironclad ship, and the atomic and hydrogen bombs were developed by immigrants.

In short, the study concludes that "Throughout history and even now, immigrants have demonstrated their loyalty to this country, and have voluntarily sacrificed to protect the freedom of civil rights and the pride of this Nation itself."

Let us stop talking about the myths and misconceptions of immigrants. Let us look at the facts. It is a fact that most immigrants enter the United States legally; about 70 percent, according to the American immigration law forum. It is a fact that most immigrants come to the United States to unite with close family members. People come to this country for the American dream of freedom, peace, economic prosperity, opportunity, and democracy. They do not come here to take advantage of the welfare system.

Contrary to popular belief, not all immigrants are Mexican or Chinese. Many are from places, African countries like Somalia, Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Ghana, escaping violent upheavals; from Haiti, fleeing war, political oppression, drought, and famine. There are many children in Romania, China, and Brazil fleeing poverty and hunger.

Many wait in places like the Philippines, where the average waiting period is as long as 12 to 15 years. There is a need for fair and more efficient immigration policy and a more efficient system.

According to a 1996 report released by the Illinois Immigrant Policy Project, immigrants make up 7.1 percent of the total State population, and 49.2 percent of the city of Chicago. Illinois immigrants pay \$7.2 billion, or 10.6 percent of the \$68 billion of taxes paid by all Illinois residents.

The seven taxes included in this estimate are Federal and State income, State and local tax, property, Social Security, and unemployment insurance.

□ 1315

Additionally, immigrants only use 7 percent of major welfare and education services. The programs included in this estimate include most of the large cash and in-kind welfare programs and the basic education, SSI, AFDC, aid to the aged, blind and disabled, transitional assistance, Medicaid, and K through 12 public education. Thus when the seven major taxes are compared to the five major types of governmental services, immigrants in Illinois actually pay more taxes than services used. They are paying \$6.11 for every \$1 of services received.

Mr. Speaker, these findings reveal that immigrants are substantial economic contributors. And some 70 percent of immigrants' taxes flow to the Federal Government, primarily through Federal income and Social Security taxes.

It is a fact that immigrants start new businesses; 18 percent of all new small businesses are started by immigrants. These small businesses account for up to 80 percent of the new jobs available in the United States each year.

Now, having stated the facts, I would urge my fellow Members of Congress to take the partisan politics out of the immigration debate. While this issue is being politicized, there are many constituents in my district who are unable to naturalize and stand to soon lose much-needed benefits underneath the new welfare reform law.

It is my understanding that the last time an oath ceremony was performed was September 30, 1996. Why should immigrants experience longer delays due to the decisions of government bureaucracy? Citizenship USA was enacted with bipartisan support and was a good idea in order to reduce the backlog of some 1 million eligible immigrants who filed in fiscal 1995 to become U.S. citizens. This number is more than triple the number of citizens who filed in recent years. This can be largely contributed to the 1986 amnesty program, the passage of issues like proposition 187 in California, and the threat of losing benefits due to welfare reform.

I would like to note that out of the 1.3 million new citizens naturalized under Citizenship USA, only about 71,500 were found to have FBI records, which includes the following categories: INS administrative record, 34,000; misdemeanor but not a felony, 25,000; felony 10,000. Sixty-nine percent have still demonstrated good moral character, 29 percent good moral character may not have been met, further review is required. Two percent good moral character was not met, represents 168 individuals, 168 individuals out of the 1.3 million that naturalized under Citizenship USA is only about two-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is hardly reason to exploit naturalized citizens as criminals. Prior to the program Citizenship USA, applicants waited 2 to 4 years to become citizens.

Given that so many elderly and disabled people were at risk to lose much-needed benefits due to welfare reform, it is my opinion that Citizenship USA actually served as a partial solution to some of the negative effects of welfare reform and in response to the criticisms aimed at a high number of these newly naturalized citizens registered to vote, I must ask, is it not a double standard? In an election year where apathy seemed to be a common tune ringing throughout the land, why criticize any group for exercising their right to vote? Do we not teach all citizens that voting is not only the epitome of living in a democracy but a responsibility as well?

I submit that the very fabric of our social, economic, cultural, and political institutions has changed into a great, great mosaic due to our Nation's newcomers. Immigrants are an integral part of our work force, tax base, and cultural diversity. May we as a Nation of immigrants not turn on ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will now shift to another idea, one that we have been discussing, debating, and talking about and will continue to do so as we talk about the reauthorization of ISTEA. I appreciate having this opportunity to speak in behalf of projects which have been proposed for the Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this country are in favor of policies and programs that meet discernible needs, create jobs, promote economic development, protect and improve the environment, and improve the overall quality of life. I shall describe four projects which are consistent with these goals and trust that they will be seriously considered by the Congress for funding, as they will greatly benefit the residents of Chicago, its western suburbs, and Cook County.

One, Marion Street mall-to-mall transit center and commuter parking facility in Oak Park, IL, is one of these projects. This project will increase rider access to several different forms of public transportation, including bus, elevated trains, and passenger rails. It will provide reciprocal access to suburban and city of Chicago residents who need public transportation to get to and from work. It will promote commercial revitalization for the villages of Oak Park and River Forest and reduce the number of cars on the roadways, thereby enhancing air quality and improvement of the overall environment.

Mr. Speaker, the second project is the funding of a preliminary engineering project to determine the feasibility and cost of widening the Union Pacific bridge over Illinois State Route 43 at Harlem Avenue.

Presently this stretch of road, which is considered a strategic arterial route, has shortcomings which cannot be easily and readily remedied. Principally the bridge embodies a dangerous center pier which severely impedes traffic

flow. Simply by widening the two-spanned structure, we can decrease the potential number of accidents as well as facilitate the flow of traffic. The reduction in congestion on the bridge will diminish the amount of air pollution and gridlock on the road.

The third project calls for the establishment of an Intelligent Transportation Systems Research Institute. This institute would marshal the research capabilities of the University of Illinois at Chicago and Champaign-Urbana, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Purdue University in Indiana, and the Argonne National Laboratory.

In an effort to employ communications technology as a solution to some of the region's inter- and intrastate traffic problems, the target area is the region spanning from Gary, IN, through Chicago, IL, and on to Milwaukee, WI. This stretch is essential for efficient commercial travel throughout the region.

An example of the technology that the Intelligent Transportation Institute will explore includes computerized traffic lights. These lights will be capable of detecting the approach of a massive public transportation bus or a commercial truck and will stay green longer to permit their passage.

Mr. Speaker, this is an idea whose time has truly come. This innovation will facilitate a way of ingress and egress from Chicago's commercial districts to the expressways linking Gary and Milwaukee. It will also expedite travel time for all workers. Through such technologies, we will be able to create a more effective transportation system.

In addition, this system will provide through the use of communications technology real-time schedules for public transportation. One will be able to access the scheduling information from work and from home. At a time when both parents work most of the day and single parents are forced to work two and three jobs, any way we can make travel time more predictable, reliable, and efficient allows American citizens to spend more time with their families. Our transportation policies can and should work to strengthen families.

Evaluation results to date show that the intelligent transportation system will yield major benefits in congestion mitigation, safety and environmental impact. To date, public and private organizations have succeeded in raising half of the financing required for the project, which has a total cost of \$6 million. Therefore, the Federal share of this worthwhile endeavor will be only one half the actual cost.

The fourth project proposes a north-south computer rail line by Metra with the station in the Village of Bellwood. Bellwood is ideally located as a crossroads of the Chicago metropolitan area at the juncture of Interstates 290, 88, and 94, between O'Hare and Midway Airports. Both Metra and the Village of Bellwood view this project as a real opportunity for partnership in dealing

with transportation needs and economic development for the region.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, and the people of the Seventh Congressional District in the State of Illinois feel that each one of these projects is viable, valuable, greatly needed and will seriously enhance the quality of life for the residents, of people who live in that particular area.

Now to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall address briefly the issue that I think is so vitally important in this country, and that is the issue of children's health. I firmly believe that the greatness of a society can be determined by how well it treats its old, its young, and those who have difficulty caring for themselves. If this is the case, then by all standards we are not moving toward greatness because we are not doing well by our children.

In my own hometown, Chicago, the city of the big shoulders, the Annie E. Casey Foundation reports that 10.9 percent of all children born are considered low birth weight. According to the Voices for Illinois Children, more than 13,200 of all new mothers in the State, 4,000 in Chicago alone, receive virtually no prenatal care. We all know that there are more than 10 million children in this country who have no health insurance. We know that a disproportionate number of our children are being born to teen parents and are destined to live in the squalor of poverty and deprivation.

□ 1330

We know that it is tough to be hungry and not have food; demoralizing to be broke and not have a job; agonizing to be cold and not have heat; and frustrating to be illiterate and not have hope. But to be sick and not be able to get health care adds another dimension to all the other problems.

The blues singer Marvin Gaye asked the question, "Who will save the baby? Who is willing to try? Who will save a world that is destined to die?" Another songwriter said that "Our children are indeed the future. Teach them well and let them lead the way."

Everybody is searching for a hero. People need somebody to look up to. And so I ask the question this day: Can the children of this Nation look to its Congress to be the hero? Can the children of this Nation look to this Congress to preserve, promote and protect the health of the Nation, the future of our country, and the destiny of our being?

So I ask the question: Will this Congress save the children? We sure can, if we are willing to try.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of clause 1 of rule XLVIII and clause 6(f) of rule X,

and notwithstanding the requirement of clause 1(a)3 of rule XLVIII, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. SKELTON of Missouri and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

There was no objection.

#### RECLAIMING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my 5 minutes. I was unfortunately delayed earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD PRESERVE A STRONG PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in these 5-minute speech periods we heard from one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], about a fight that Mr. Ray Damadian has gone through over these last 25 years in order to secure his right of ownership to a piece of technology that he invented. We are talking about the inventor of the MRI.

This technology, which has saved thousands, perhaps even millions of lives over these last 25 years and permitted the medical profession to diagnose people without having to cut them open, as in the past, has been a tremendous boon to all of mankind. It, in fact, has been a major export item for the United States of America.

The MRI was one of those great inventions, along with the airplane, along with the light bulb, along with so many other inventions that Americans are so proud came from the United States of America. And Ray Damadian, perhaps more than anybody that I know personally, reflects this type of creative genius for which Americans are so proud and this type of creative genius that had meant everything to our standard of living and improved the well-being of people all over the world in the process.

As my colleague Mr. FORBES stated, Mr. Damadian has been in a 25-year fight to maintain his patent rights. Twenty-five years he has fought against this huge corporation, General Electric, for the rights of ownership of his own creative genius.

Why this is important is because Mr. Damadian was protected by a relatively strong patent law and a strong patent system. In fact, the United States has had the strongest patent protection of any Nation in the world. This is what has given us the edge on all our other competitors around the world. This is what has made America safe and secure. This is what has given

the average person in America an opportunity and a standard of living that is basically sought after by people from all over the planet. It has been our technology and our freedom. And the American patent system is what has created this impulse, this momentum for the creating of technology.

Our patent system is under attack now. The Ray Damadians in the future, if we permit H.R. 400, a bill that is going through Congress as we speak, if H.R. 400 passes, the Ray Damadians of the world will be chewed up and spit out by the huge corporations, just like his counterparts in Japan and other countries are beaten down by the economic shoguns of their society.

What is happening is there is an attempt, and hold on to your horses here, folks, you may not have heard this before, what is happening is there is a move to make American patent law, which has been the strongest in the world, to be exactly a mirror image of the law in Japan, and they are not bringing up the Japanese standards to the protection our people have been afforded. They are bringing down the protections that have been offered to Americans.

In 20 years this will mean the United States will no longer be the technological leader of the world. The standards of our people will be under attack, and they will never know what hit them because they changed the fundamental laws.

It is happening very quietly here, and the multinational organizations have hired the best lobbyists in town to come here and influence Congress and unless the American people let their feelings be known, H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, will pass, and the Ray Damadians of the world, the men who create the technology that changes our way of life, will find themselves vulnerable and pretty soon we will not be seeing the MRI's being invented, pretty soon we will not see the technology of the Wright brothers. In fact, the Wright brothers will end up vulnerable to the Mitsubishis of the world.

If that would have been the practice back at the turn of the century, the aerospace industry could have well been developed in Japan instead of the United States and the American people would never have known what hit them. We have to stand up for the United States of America and stand up for the fact that we need to be the technological leaders of the world.

H.R. 400, believe it or not, mandates that every person who applies for a patent in the United States, after 18 months, whether or not that patent has been granted, it is going to be published for the entire world to see. Every thief, every copycat, every economic adversary, every country that hates us and wants to destroy the American way of life will have the advantage of being in possession of all of our technological secrets even before the patent has been issued.

In Ray Damadian's case that means General Electric would actually have

had his information before the patent was issued to Ray and, for sure, he would not have been able to defend himself.

We will cease to be a great power. Our people will cease to have the standard of living if we cease to be the technological leader of the world. H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, will make us incredibly vulnerable to our economic adversaries. And, by the way, it also obliterates the Patent Office in the U.S. Government. It will take away the Patent Office, which was established by our Constitution, and replace it with a corporatized entity, and who knows what kind of influences will be on the patent examiners when they are now in a corporatized job rather than a Government job.

Our patent examiners have worked hard. They have been part of our system but they have been protected by civil service and other protections and the knowledge that they were Government employees. The fact is that will not be the same if we make it a corporatized entity.

H.R. 811 and 812 will fight against H.R. 400 and protect the American patent system. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 811 and 812 and to oppose the Steal American Technologies Act, H.R. 400.

#### DEFINING DEVIANCY, UP AND DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let me say I think the gentleman from California has a wonderful idea and I am certainly pleased to be a cosponsor of his bill.

I wanted to talk today about something that occurred in this Chamber yesterday, something that was ridiculed by people that I consider to be radicals, dismissed by many in the media, called trivial by many observers, but in my mind we did something very significant yesterday.

We have seen over the past 30 years that the radical revolution of the left has torn this country apart at the seams. We live today in a country, as the Speaker says, that has 12-year-old children on drugs, 15-year-olds shooting each other, and 18-year-olds graduating from high school with diplomas that they cannot even read. America has lived in a valueless society that our radical policies of the past 30 years have created.

In 1994, there was a shift back to the center, and yesterday I believe that Congress passed a simple resolution that helped move us back to the right direction where our Founding Fathers wanted us to be.

So what was this dangerous piece of legislation? What was this supposedly unconstitutional resolution? What was this frightening document that the radicals said would spell an end to the separation between church and state and tear the Constitution apart at the seams? It was a very simple resolution that said a court in Alabama ought to be able to hang the Ten Commandments on the wall, the same way that the Supreme Court of the United States hangs the Ten Commandments on the wall in its building, just as we in this Congress every morning pledge allegiance and hear a prayer as we look up to the words "In God We Trust," just as Americans for the first 200 years of this civilization were not afraid to acknowledge that God and faith played a key role in the founding of this country.

Now, these radicals will tell you that this resolution we passed yesterday did violence to the Constitution and was something that the Founding Fathers would never agree with. They would also tell you that they were the ones that would have to step in to protect the Constitution, and yet I think it is very instructive at this point to look back at what the father of the Constitution said regarding the Ten Commandments. The father of the Constitution was also the fourth President of the United States, James Madison. And while drafting the Constitution, Madison said,

We have staked the entire future of America's civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves, and sustain ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

So here we have the father of the Constitution telling us that the Constitution and American civilization was based upon the Ten Commandments of God. Here we have a situation where the Father of our country, George Washington, in his farewell address spoke to America and said, "It is impossible to govern rightly without God and the Ten Commandments."

We had Founding Father after Founding Father writing the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, who recognized that we were a country, one country under God, a country who knew its Judeo-Christian heritage and did not run away from it.

It is something they do not teach in schools, it is something the radicals do not want anyone to know about, but that is how it has been in this country until recently, until we had the radicals storm the streets in the 1960's and undermine our efforts across the globe, who in the 1970's stormed Washington and think tanks, and who in the 1980's took control of Hollywood and took control of the people making the TV shows that our children see, and who in the 1990's, unfortunately, took control of some of the highest seats of power in the United States of America.

□ 1345

It is very frightening to me, and it is very frightening, because what they

have sought to do and I think what they have accomplished is doing something called defining deviancy down and defining deviancy up. And those are a couple of catch phrases that Senator MOYNIHAN created and also a columnist named Charles Krauthammer created. To do that, what you try to do is you try to make the conventional seem radical and you try to make the radical seem conventional.

So we find ourselves 30 years later in a civilization where the words of Madonna, that life of Larry Flynt, and the acts of Dennis Rodman are glorified and take the place of the words of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and fill this valueless void that used to be filled and made complete by our Judeo-Christian heritage. It is a dangerous situation, it is a dangerous situation for my 6-year-old boy and my 9-year-old boy, and yet all they will tell us is that there is something called the separation between church and state.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about religion. This debate is not about morality. This debate is not about Christianity. This debate is about America's proud heritage. I am more afraid, much, much more afraid of intolerance of ideas and of political correctness than I am of letting Americans know what their proud heritage has been and what it will be once again.

Mr. Speaker, we can build a bridge to the 21st century. I have got no problem with that. I just have a problem with radicals that would want to disconnect us from our proud heritage in the past that made America the greatest country in the history not only of Western civilization but in the history of this world.

My friend from California is here who has been talking about this for years. He has almost been like a voice crying in the wilderness while many people here did not want to talk about it while the radicals had control of power.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. When we talk about the Judeo-Christian heritage of our country, and let us remember, by the way, there are many people who agree with the Judeo-Christian tenets, for example, are in the Muslim community as well. This is not an attempt to try to force any type of religious prayer or religious concept on others. But what we do and what today we are faced with is that those people who stand for certain values and certain traditions find themselves under attack.

One of the greatest parts of the Judeo-Christian heritage is a concept called individual responsibility, that you are responsible for your actions and that you will face that responsibility before God. And so really, individual freedom is part of that Judeo-Christian heritage that we talk about. That is where it ties into our Founding Fathers, who believed that freedom of religion was a right that they would

fight for. That has been so turned around and so disfigured today that what we have got are people who are trying to express their own religious beliefs are being told, in the name of separation of church and state, in the name of the Constitution to shut up.

How many times do we have to hear the ACLU and others say, you cannot put a manger scene in front of city hall, before we start saying to ourselves, something is wrong here. Whose freedom are we talking about? The freedom of someone who wants to just express a belief in God, whether it is a manger scene or a Star of David during a time of religious importance to one of the great faiths of our country. There is nothing wrong with having them be able to express themselves, and we Christians or Jews or Muslims express ourselves that way. But we have the left wing who is committed to use the force of law to prevent people in our society from expressing their religious beliefs using the separation of church and state as a hammer to prevent us from expressing ourselves.

In my part of the country out in Orange County, the Boy Scouts of America are spending tens of thousands of dollars in order to defend themselves against what? Defend themselves against some liberal left-wing parent who is trying to force the Scouts to take God out of the Scout oath because his children do not want to say "God." Because his children do not want to say "God," it should not be in the Scout oath. This is absolutely an attack on the freedom of those people in the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America. Yet where is the outcry in this? Where are the people who supposedly believe in freedom of speech?

The greatest threat today against people who believe in God, whether they be Christians, Jews, or Muslims, is the U.S. Government coming under the domination of atheists who want to suppress people's expression of their own religion.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The gentleman has touched on something, we have seen it on local school boards, he has touched on something that we have seen up here for too long now. What that is, is people parading around in a politically correct cloak that will tell us in the name of tolerance that they have a right to be intolerant, that they have a right again to preach this valueless void, where Jews, Christians, Muslims cannot express their views.

Mr. Speaker, I do not fear my 9-year-old boy, who is in public schools, hearing somebody who is of the Muslim faith speak. I do not fear my 9-year-old boy hearing an orthodox Jew speak to him or to his class or a Catholic or a Pentecostal or a Baptist. I do not fear that. America, according to Jefferson, who the radicals are now calling radical, according to Jefferson, America is the free marketplace of ideas, where the strongest ideas survive. Yet what they want to do is this sort of moral leveling, where there is this valueless

void where nothing is right, nothing is wrong, nothing is black, nothing is white, nothing is legal, nothing is illegal.

We are seeing that manifest in the papers every day when officials in this administration continue to talk about moral revelancy, moral equivalency: Hey, nothing is right, nothing is wrong; I know what the law says, but it is not really important.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will yield further, we have more people being told they cannot put a traditional manger scene in front of city hall or at the school yard during Christmas time. At the same time, these same people, by the way, are insisting that we are engaged in censorship if we refuse to let the NEA, the National Endowment for the Arts, give grants to people who blatantly attack religion, blatantly attack other people's faith. It is okay to subsidize it, but it is wrong for us to put up a manger scene to respect the birth of Christ or to have a Star of David to reflect our worshiping on Passover or some of the other religious holidays that we have.

This has come to the point where the Boy Scouts of America, for example, as I said, not only, people are trying to force God out of the Scout oath. Here is one of the most decent organizations in the history of our country, who has done more to help young people through these hard times in their life, when they are coming into adulthood than Scouting, the young men and young women of our country teaching great values. Now they are having to spend tens of thousands of dollars, just, No. 1, to keep God in the Scout oath and, No. 2, to have standards so that they will have standards so that scoutmasters have a certain moral standard.

There have been a lot of attacks on the religious right, and I will say that I do not attack other people's beliefs, but one thing I demand is that my beliefs that I hold true should not be attacked as well and we should have a right to express it. The religious right more often than not is simply saying and representing a group of Americans that have a set of beliefs and just want to believe that for their own family. And they are saying the Federal Government should not force us to accept another standard which we believe to be immoral.

And the Boy Scouts of America, it has to do, and I will be flat out about it, the hiring of homosexuals as scoutmasters. That is their right as a private organization to do that. And I believe that, if they did not have that standard, a lot of parents would not permit their children into the Scouts and to go out under adult supervision of someone who is sexually attracted to someone of the same sex. But that is the right of that organization.

In San Diego, in California, they said the Boy Scouts could not even use school facilities. They could not use

the school facilities which their tax dollars are paying for unless they were willing to take the ban off hiring homosexuals as scoutmasters. In other words, they have to eliminate their moral standards. This is ridiculous. This is an attack on their rights.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. What radicals do is, and what they have done by defining deviancy down as up, is radicals attack conventional beliefs, they attack the foundation of this Republic, the views by our Founding Fathers, because that is the only way they can seem less radical. They attack the Ten Commandments as being radical and unconstitutional even though the father of our Constitution says that America's civilization is based on the Ten Commandments. They attack the Boy Scouts, saying it is a radical organization.

They attack the Christian right. I have never heard them attack the Christian left. I will be really honest. It is so politically correct to attack the Christian right that many people who agree with the Christian right do not come close to them because they have been the third rail of American politics for some time, touch them and you die.

If I stand up and support something that the Christian right is doing, then I am immediately a member of a suspect class, much as in the past those on the left were seen as members of the suspect class. It is a modern version of McCarthyism.

Let me read one thing and then I will yield further to the gentleman. I want to read something that Robert Bork wrote in a great book called "Slouching Towards Gomorrah." I think this explains why radicals have been able to get away with what radicals have gotten away with for the past 30 years and why they have made the conventional seem radical.

Bork writes on page 7 of "Slouching Towards Gomorrah":

Modern liberalism is powerful because it has enlisted our cultural elites; those who man the institutions that manufacture, manipulate and disseminate ideas, attitudes and symbols. Universities, churches, Hollywood, the national press, print and electronic, foundation staffs, the public interests, organizations, much of the congressional Democratic party, and some of the congressional Republicans as well and large sections of the judiciary, including all too often a majority of the Supreme Court.

People do not realize this. That is why one cannot turn on the news at night and get the straight news, because the same people, and they do not want you to say this. They want to revise history. They tried to revise the words of Jefferson and Madison and Lincoln. They want to revise what they did in the 1960's. The same people who marched in the streets in the 1960's and according to the North Vietnamese generals after the war, won the war for North Vietnam. That is their words, not mine. Those same people in the 1970's, in the 1980's and 1990's went straight to these areas, these cultural institutions where they could continue

to shape and manufacture ideas and continue to make the conventional seem radical.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Your basic point about those of us expressing another view becoming beaten down, I will have to say, I just expressed something a few moments ago about the hiring of homosexuals by the Boy Scouts. Let me say that I personally never criticize people's personal lives. I do not. I will answer to God for my personal life and I have my own set of beliefs. I just will not criticize people for their personal lives. But let me say, I demand the right for myself and for others to have the right to make those value judgments and to make those stands and to express them.

But I can tell you right now, I will be attacked by saying the Boy Scouts have a right to set their own standards, I will be attacked as if I am advocating an attack on somebody else. In reality, it is the opposite. It is the people with more traditional values who are under attack.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And you would be called a bigot because you do not sit back and say absolutely nothing. Again it is not an issue of intolerance, it is not an issue of whether I am going to judge somebody for the life they live. That is up to them. That is what America is about. But at the same time private organizations have a right to make private decisions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. They have an obligation.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. They have an obligation. But again this is what has happened to us over the past 30 years, why we have been cowed, why we have been beaten down. Every time we try to speak up for values and beliefs that we hold dear and that our Founding Fathers hold dear, we are attacked by extremists in an extreme manner. We are called bigots, we are called racists.

I was just in an education hearing where I simply said that I believe that parents and teachers and school board members should have a bigger say in their education than bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

□ 1400

This person testifying, supporting the President, the President's proposals, basically said that if we left it to the States, then we would have handicapped children locked in closets, that we would have private schools taking control who did not care about handicapped children, who did not care about children with dirty clothes, who did not care about all these other things.

Now I have got to tell you we have not stood up and said enough is enough, and I can tell you as a Baptist who went to a Catholic parochial school I am insulted, and I am not afraid to say it any more, I am insulted by radicals attacking us, telling us that we do not care simply because we want to give power to parents instead of give power to bureaucrats, and it is

time that we stopped being cowed by these radicals that have destroyed this country over the past 30 years. It is time that we say enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Yes, I find your conversation very interesting, and it reminds me of a incident that occurred not too many years ago.

I am a physician. I graduated from medical school in 1961, and at that particular time they decided that saying the Hippocratic oath was no longer necessary, and I did not recite the Hippocratic oath at my graduation.

But when my son graduated there in 1988, they allowed us to come back to say the Hippocratic oath. We were given that chance to come back because they were saying it once again, and I was very interested in this, so I went to his graduation, and at the ceremony they were reciting the Hippocratic oath. And lo and behold, when I looked carefully at it, it was not the same oath. They had changed the clause on abortion. It did not say that you should not use an instrument to do an abortion. They merely said you should follow the law, whatever the law is.

So I thought that was a interesting little story to support your case that truth seems to be easily revised in this day and age.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman. And revisionism occurs all the time, and we are told that our Founding Fathers were racists and bigots and that they were radicals and that is—you know, that did not happen before 1994. It is very interesting that Jefferson was the hero of liberals until 1994, and then a group of us got elected quoting Jefferson, saying the government that governs least governs best, and suddenly he was not a useful hero. In fact, we had people actually writing op-eds this past year saying that the Jefferson Memorial needed to be taken down brick by brick by brick because he was a racist and because he was a radical.

Mr. Speaker, that just shows how desperate revisionists are. They would say the same thing of Abraham Lincoln if we quoted Lincoln too much, and I want to quote Lincoln because I am sure that if a President, sitting President today, said these words, he or she would be called a radical. Abraham Lincoln said this in 1863 in a proclamation.

He said we have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other Nation has ever grown, but we have forgotten God. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace and too proud to pray to the God that made us.

My gosh. If we said that, we would be called radicals, we would be called extremists, and now what they will tell us is that this is about religion, that you are trying to make everybody a Christian or a Jew or a Muslim. It is

not the case. This fight is not about establishing a religion because that is unconstitutional, and I am against it 100 percent. What this is about is reconnecting our children and our grandchildren with their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, you know I agree in what you are saying and being able to speak what you think, and I appreciate your quoting Lincoln because he is also one of my heroes. And it kind of ties in with a couple of things that I wanted to mention this afternoon, you know, and this is really kind of in view of our bipartisan retreat that is coming up. I kind of wanted to remind people, making an appeal that, you know the words of the great American philosopher, Pogo: We have met the enemy, and he is us.

I think there are few of us who have been entrusted with the honor of serving in this great institution that are unaware of the low esteem in which we are corporately regarded today. And you know sometimes in the interest of reelection, flawed egos or some purposes of political or personal gain, we abuse our privilege and we dishonor our predecessors and slight our fellow Americans and weaken our Nation, and you know it has been true that there have been scoundrels in the past that have thrown shadows over this great noble body. But you know we have gotten to the point where there is a great deal of distrust and cynicism out there in what we do and what goes on here, in the way we treat one another.

And so I guess I am just saying that, you know, we claim to trust God, and in His name I would like to ask us to really reason together for the good of all and, you know, let us respect one another and tolerate one another's differences and not get upset when somebody says something that they deeply believe, but try and work together and stop destroying one another and lift one another up and endeavor to achieve the height of leadership the American people not only deserve but that they expect of us. And let us seek to be a credit to our Nation and proper example to our world and a joy to our God, and I believe that Lincoln who have agreed with that. Do you not?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I certainly do, and I certainly appreciate your words because I guess this is what has disappointed me over the past 2 years more than anything else.

There are Members here who I disagree with on practically every issue, Members like RON DELLUMS of California. He is on National Defense. I do not think I could find anybody on the issue of national defense that I disagree with more. I do not think I could find anybody on several other issues that I disagree with more. Quite frankly, I think his views are not the best views for America's future. The same with BARNEY FRANK from Massachusetts. But I have got to tell you I can talk to BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, and it

helps me as a conservative, talking to a liberal who I disagree with to see whether my views are correct or to see whether I am taking an easier path than I should be taking.

The same thing with RON DELLUMS. I had a great talk with RON DELLUMS when we first got here. He came over, he walked over from that side of the aisle, over here where a lot of us were sitting, young Republicans who had just gotten elected, and we talked for a while. And he said to me, he goes: "You know,"—he said, "I don't understand why all you young guys are Republicans, why you're all conservatives. It doesn't make sense to me. Explain it to me."

And I said to him, I said, "Well, you know, Congressman, when you look on this side of the aisle, your views were shaped in the 1950's and 1960's. You saw a Republican majority that supported public discrimination, that supported a lot of the things that happened in the Southeast, where I am from, that were morally repugnant, and the party of Vietnam and Watergate. When I look on your side of the aisle, I think of where I was in 1979, 1978, 1979, 1980, when I first started becoming politically involved, or in my mind watching TV, and as I was about to start college, and I see the party of the Iran hostage crisis. I see the party of Jimmy Carter. I see the party of 21-percent interest rates. I see the party of a failed liberal policy that has bankrupted this country."

So we come from two different worlds, but we can still respect each other, and RON DELLUMS, always a gentleman, said to me, said something like, "That is really deep, man," or whatever RON said, and we respect each other. I think most everybody in this Chamber respects RON DELLUMS.

When RON was over on the Committee on National Security as chairman, hardly any Republicans and most Democrats agreed with him, but when I first got here and I started saying, well, how is this Member and how is that Member, when we talked about RON DELLUMS, they said, "Hey, don't say anything bad about RON. He may be out there in left field ideologically, but at the same time the guy is fair."

And so we can disagree without being disagreeable. We can get on the floor, and we can debate in the strongest terms possible, and we need to do that without becoming personal in our attacks.

Mrs. MYRICK. I think that is true, and that is one thing that has been missing, and it is a good point that you make because this place is such a busy place that you do not take time to build those friendships and you do not take time to walk across that aisle and get to know somebody else, and I think that has been a big mistake and I hope that all of us can start to do more of that sharing and really try and reach out, and have our disagreements because you are going to have to disagree philosophically. We will have a lot of

differences; that is the way it is. But it does not mean that you cannot establish those friendships, and I commend you for doing that.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, and I agree with her. We do need to establish these friendships, and at the same time we do not need to create this false, bland bipartisanship where nobody is afraid to speak their mind because the American people might be upset that two independent minds in the free marketplace of ideas disagree with each other. Do not be afraid when you turn on C-SPAN and somebody is pointing across the aisle to somebody else and talking about how they disagree. That is how we move forward as a country, two competing ideas. Unfortunately many of us on the conservative side have been quiet for too long.

Early on in the Bork book he quotes a poet, William Butler Yates, in a great poem called "The Second Coming," and the last line talks about the beast slouching toward Bethlehem. The book is obviously called "Slouching Toward Gomorrah," but this is what Bork highlights, the part where it says the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity. For too long the best have lacked all conviction, the best have remained silent as this country has gone down a radical left path that our Founding Fathers would have been absolutely horrified in, a path that dooms our children.

It is not just cultural. It is economic, too. You know, we have got a \$5.6 trillion debt, and we still do not have enough people in this town with the willpower to spend only as much money as we take in.

So what does that mean? It means that our children are going to be burdened with an incredible debt as they grow older.

My 6- and 9-year-old boys 20 years from now are going to be paying 89 percent of every dollar they make to the Federal Government, and that was not a Republican that came up with that. That came from Senator BOB KERREY's independent commission on entitlement reform, you see, because these baby boomers who are slouching toward retirement will overwhelm the system too soon.

You know, back in the 1950's there were 15 people working for every 1 person on Social Security. Today there are 3 people working for every 1 person on Social Security. And 20 years from now when baby boomers are retiring, there is going to be 1 person working for every 1 person on Social Security. So that means our children will not have 14 others in a pool to help pay the beneficiary their benefits that were promised to them. We will only have 1 person working for every 1 person on Social Security, and I have got to tell you the prospects are bleak if we do not have the moral conviction and the moral courage to step forward and save our children's future, and ensure them the same American dream that our

parents and grandparents tried to pass on to us.

One member of our historic freshman class of the 104th Congress is the gentleman from South Carolina, who has been looking into how we can make Social Security solvent for our senior citizens without bankrupting our children, and there are going to be a lot of different ideas. We may not agree on what is the best approach, but I can tell you that in the free marketplace of ideas the only way that we can move forward with an agenda that can save our children and save our grandparents from economic calamity is to debate in the free marketplace of ideas and hopefully do so without people demagoging and trying to scare our eldest citizens.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] for a few minutes, and if he could, to discuss one of his proposals.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In our limited time I will not really go into a proposal we are working on, but what I would like to do for just a few minutes is talk about the problem that is before us, because as the gentleman suggested, we have a very considerable problem if we do nothing. There is the old saying of hear no evil, speak no evil, see no evil, the three monkeys. That seems to be the way Congress is at this point approaching Social Security. It is the most important program we have in this country and it is absolutely vital that we save it.

To save it, we have to begin, as the gentleman suggested, by talking about it. What is interesting about this problem is not what Republicans have said, not what Democrats have said, not what Ross Perot has said, but what the trustees for the trust fund itself have said; that if we do nothing, Social Security will go bankrupt in 2029, and it will begin to run deficits around 2012 when those baby boomers begin to retire, such that either we have to look at raising payroll taxes by about 16 percent, or cutting benefits by about 14 percent, or growing the deficit by roughly the same number.

What I hear from folks back home in the district is, MARK, I am struggling. The idea of raising my payroll taxes by another 16 percent makes no sense to me. When I talk to seniors, they say, MARK, I am struggling. The idea of cutting my benefits by 14 percent is not an option.

What is really interesting are the demographics behind what is driving this change. They are, one, that people are living longer. When Social Security was created in 1935, the average life expectancy was 62 years of age. Today it is 76. Every year that I grow older I hope it keeps moving in that direction, but it creates real strains on a pay-as-you-go system, which is what our system is right now.

The other demographic problem that is headed our way, and again it is, I

guess, a mixed blessing, is that we have gone from having big families on the farm to having relatively few families today. As my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, suggested, again, when Social Security was created there were 42 workers for every retiree. By 1960 there were, or 1950 rather, there were around 16 workers for every retiree. Today there are 3.2 workers for every retiree. We are well on our way to having two and then one worker for every retiree.

Again, that is a demographic phenomenon we are not going to change. For me to suggest to my wife—we have three little boys—Jennie, what do you think, another six or seven children and I think we can maybe help to solve this Social Security problem, is not going to fly. So we are looking at demographic trends we cannot change.

That leaves us with a number of, I think, crazy options. We can wait and do nothing and let Social Security go bankrupt, which I do not think is an option. We can wait and do nothing and raise payroll taxes by 16 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can wait and do nothing and cut benefits by 14 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can grow the deficit by roughly 14 to 16 percent. I do not think that is an option. We can lower life expectancy or change fertility rates. Those are not options.

That leaves us with one option. That one option is letting people invest their own money in their own savings accounts and letting that grow and compound over time.

Einstein was once asked, what is the most powerful force in the universe? His reply was, compound interest. It is amazing what you can end up with at the end of a working lifetime if you put a little bit away into your own account that politicians cannot get their hands on, again, over a working lifetime.

I just wanted to touch for a few minutes on the problem. I will be back on many other visits to talk about many of the benefits that would come with change, or our specific ideas on the subject. But I did not want to interrupt my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for more than just a couple of minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me ask the gentleman quickly, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has been talking about taking Social Security off budget. What we mean by that is right now I think Social Security is running about a \$62 billion, \$63 billion surplus.

When we get together and talk about balancing the budget, one of the ways we do it is say, we have \$63 billion over in that trust fund. Why do we not do a little accounting trick and shift it over, and that will make our job \$63 billion easier when they know they cannot get their hands on that anyway.

Unfortunately, there is a conspiracy of silence on both sides of the aisle with Congress and the President, because it is in the President's best interest to try to balance the budget. He

says he is going to balance the budget, and he has a balanced budget plan. It is \$62 billion out of whack. If we add the \$62 billion surplus in Social Security that he is counting on to cook the books, it is \$120 billion in red. The same thing with the Republicans.

If we have the courage, and I pray that we still do, if we have the courage to come forward with a plan to balance the budget, and yet if we shift \$62 billion over from a Social Security trust fund in an accounting trick that we cannot use, then we are \$62 billion short.

So I support the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN]. Does the gentleman from South Carolina support the gentleman from Wisconsin's proposal?

Mr. SANFORD. I do. As we both know, it will not save Social Security in the long run, because we have this giant demographic shift coming our way as the baby boomers begin to retire in 2012, and there are 730 million. They are about double the size of the generation before and double the size of the generation after.

In other words, it will not save us from that avalanche of graying in America, if you want to call it that, that is headed our way, but it would certainly be a step in the right direction. And most importantly, as the gentleman suggests, if Washington is to be trusted, we have to have, in essence, honest accounting.

For us to say a trust fund, but it is not really a trust fund, is not honest accounting. For us to use Social Security moneys to in essence mask the size of the real operating budget here in Washington again is not an honest accounting. What I hear from folks back home in my district say is that they would like to see honest accounting, and they would like trust fund money to stay in its trust fund.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. When you talk about honest accounting, and talking about trust, I have to tell the gentleman, his job is going to be made more difficult, the job of the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to be made more difficult, and this institution's job is going to be made more difficult in this area and the entitlement area in general, because of the shameless display we saw over the past 2 years of those who would attack us because we were trying to keep Medicare solvent.

The gentleman talked about the trustees. They told us that Medicare was going bankrupt. So we had a group of people step forward with a bold proposal, and the Speaker of the House, who has been fodder for every political campaign over the past 2 years, the Speaker actually had the courage to step forward and say, I know Medicare is the third rail of American politics, I know we are not supposed to touch entitlements; but it is dying and we had better fix it now. If we do not fix it now, we are going to have to pay for it later, and it is going to be seniors and

middle-class taxpayers who take the biggest hit if we do not fix it now.

So we stepped forward and we had the courage to do something 2 years ago. Unfortunately, we paid for it in political terms, because there were others that used that against us.

I have to say that if I could do anything this session, it would be to once again instill in the hearts and minds of all these people the courage to step forward and do what has to be done to make Medicare solvent, to make Social Security solvent; because all these other issues about cutting a program 2 percentage points or 4 percentage points, or increasing school lunch programs 4 percentage points instead of 6 percentage points, they are irrelevant.

In the long run, they are irrelevant economically, because it is Medicare, it is Social Security, it is Medicaid that is expanding at such a rapid clip that it is going to overwhelm all of us, it is going to overwhelm this Congress, and it is going to create an economic meltdown if we do not do something about it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate him letting me borrow a little of his time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman, because it does really play into what we were talking about before, and that is talking about creating a civilization that is more connected, more closely connected to the views of our Founding Fathers, to the views of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln, than to the cultural views of what happened in the 1960s or what is happening now: The life of Larry Flynt or the words of Madonna or the actions of Dennis Rodman.

We have to step forward and not be afraid of our past but embrace our past, embrace the ideals of our Founding Fathers who said, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not on the power of government, but on the capacity of Americans to live and govern and control themselves according to the Ten Commandments of God"; or the ideals of Jefferson, who said that the government that governs least governs best.

Those are not radical ideas. Those are ideas for the 21st century. Those are ideas that are going to overwhelm the liberals anyway, that are going to overwhelm the radicals anyway. We are moving from an industrial age to an information society, where information disseminates, and just as the agrarian age had a decentralizing impact and the industrial age had a centralizing impact, the Information Age once again is going to empower the individual.

We in Washington should get out of the way and let individuals live as they choose to live, let individuals study as they choose to study, let them worship as they choose to worship, let them spend their hard-earned tax dollars as they choose to spend the money that they make, and we need to get out of their way and let them prosper.

If we do that, we will once again be the great civilization that we once were. We will once again be what Abraham Lincoln spoke about when he said America was the last great hope for a dying world. We still are. We have just gotten off track in the past 30 years.

And hopefully what we did yesterday, what we tried to do over the past 2 years, will begin to bear some fruit. We will create America, we will build a bridge to the 21st century also that will not be based on what happened over the past 30 years, but instead based on those great and lofty ideas that we find in the writings and words of our Founding Fathers.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you that in order for me to accept an appointment by Democratic Leader Richard Gephardt to a seat on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it will be necessary for me to interrupt my service on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as Ranking Member of its subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Rule 19 F. of the Preamble and Rules of the Democratic Caucus provides that no Democratic Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may serve on more than one standing committee during that Member's term of service on the select committee. However, the rule also provides that Members shall be entitled to take leaves of absence from service on any committee (or subcommittee thereof) during the period they serve on the select committee and seniority rights on such committee (and on each subcommittee) to which they were assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if they had continued to serve during the period of leave of absence.

While I will remain committed to protecting and enhancing the needs and benefits of our nation's veterans, this letter constitutes notice of my intent to take the necessary leave of absence from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in order to accept an appointment to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr.,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### CIVIL LIBERTIES, WHERE AMERICA IS HEADED, ITS PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order today to continue

a discussion that I started 2 weeks ago with another special order on the subject of civil liberties, where the country is going, and what some of our problems are and how we can solve them.

I am a freshman Congressman right now serving in the 105th Congress, but I served here in the Congress a few years back. I had four terms which were ended in 1984. I now return to the U.S. Congress, and probably the most common question asked of me since I have been back is how are things different. In many ways they are very similar and in some ways that is very disappointing, but in other ways they are different and hopefully we are making some progress in solving some of our problems.

The big difference, though, that I have noticed, both here on the House floor as well as watching television over the past 2 years, is that the House floor has been used in a different manner. I think the atmosphere is somewhat less relaxed. I think Members frequently are more on edge, and there may be a little less friendship, which to me is a bit sad. But also we have noticed that the House floor can be used for personal and political attacks, which I find not to be the best way to use the House floor.

□ 1430

As a matter of fact, I have more or less pledged to myself and to my constituents that is not the reason I have come to the Congress, to use the House floor for anything political or personal. Even if those attacks may occur against me on the House floor, I will choose not to answer them on the House floor because I do not think that is proper. If attacks occur, I will answer those attacks or charges in another way but not here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, in the recent special order that I did, I talked basically about the coming welfare bankruptcy of the welfare state. And I think that is one of the reasons that there are so many conflicts here on the House floor, because we are not yet seeing this in economic terms. There is still a sentiment, both in the country and in the Congress, to continue to spend a lot of money.

We have heard discussions about Social Security, and the difficulty in solving this problem and whether Social Security or any other benefits, there is a tremendous demand to continue these programs, but it is getting very, very difficult to raise the revenues. Certainly there is not an environment here today to introduce new programs and new welfare entitlements. So this difficulty in finding the funds has led to some of the problems on the House floor.

It is easy for a very wealthy country to continue to get involved in redistribution of wealth, but once the country is getting smaller and the economic conditions are such, it is a much more

difficult, much more difficult problem to solve. I think that we should do everything conceivable here on the House floor to show respect to each other. I think it is important that we show friendship. And over and above all that, I think if we are serious about the ideas, there is no reason why we cannot have some enjoyment in doing this, in trying to solve our problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to just quote one sentence from my previous special order dealing with the rising police state and the attack on our personal civil liberties. In that order, I say, centralizing powers and consistently expanding the role of government require an army of bureaucrats and a taxing authority upon which a police state thrives. And I am suggesting here, as I did before, that this is not the right direction to go and that many Americans are sincerely concerned about the power and the authority of the Federal Government. This has not been our tradition. This is not part of our Constitution. But certainly in the last several decades, we have had an accumulation of power here in Washington.

Also, my solution or my suggestion to solve these comes in thinking about the philosophy of government. If we do it just in a technical fashion and think that all we have to do is have a line item veto or have revenue scoring or have a balanced budget amendment, I think we are missing the whole point because I think it is a much bigger issue. I think it is a philosophic issue, not a technical or budgetary issue, and all of this is related to how we look at the important role for government.

The decision that we as Members of Congress have to make is whether or not government should have the power and the authority to do what they do. And in order to answer that question, we really have to ask it first. Does the Government really, does the Federal Government really have the power and the authority under our constitutional system of law to do as much as they are doing? I challenge that because I quite frankly believe that we here in the Congress do not have the authority that we have exerted here over the last several decades.

Mr. Speaker, my personal philosophy is this. It conforms with what I believe the Founders believed, that is that government should be precise. Government should be there for the protection of liberty. We should not concede to the Government the right and the power and the authority to use it in order to bring about social and economic changes. Most individuals recognize that you cannot force other individuals to do things that you want them to do. But so often we allow the Government to do the same thing. We grant them this power and authority to try to mold the country, mold people's personal behavior and of course mold the world as we intervene in so many places around the world.

In many ways, I use a political golden rule to address this subject. That is

that we must reject the use of force, personally and politically, to try to bring about these changes. Some would say, well, that sounds like pacifism because you do not want to confront, you do not want to use the authority of the state. I do not want to use the police. You do not want to use a gun to force people to do the things that you think are necessary and to obey the law.

But it is not pacifism. It is far from that. It is a system of government that is designed to encourage tolerance and volunteerism to solve our problems. The role of the state is limited to that of protecting liberty, providing for the national defense, and to make sure that individuals do not violate these rights as well, that individuals, when individuals exert force and violate another individual's rights, that certainly invites the role of government to come in and solve that problem.

In recent years, we have seen some, a better discussion about what we have to do. In the last Congress we have seen a step in the direction of at least trying to take some of these powers and some of the authority away from Washington and delivering it back to the States. Quite frankly though, I am not convinced that block grants is the whole answer, leaving the money in the States would be a much better way.

Mr. Speaker, at least the discussion is much better. We have now talked about returning the management and the financing of welfare back to the States. I find that encouraging. There are a lot of us in Congress now talking about the same thing about education. Nationalizing our educational system really has not done that much more for education. You can draw a graph and show that, as the funding went up for national control of education, the quality of the education went down directly. The same thing could be said about medicine.

It is easy to accept the argument by many of us here in Congress that welfare should be a State function, education should be a State or local function. But so often there is a resistance and no consensus on what we should do with the police powers, whether we are fighting the war on drugs or the war on the environment or whatever. But under the Constitution, it was never intended that police powers would gravitate as they have here in Washington.

So my suggestion here is that we should seriously think about that in the area of police activity, because now we have a national war on drugs which is a total failure, has not done any good, has done great harm. Not only has it not solved the serious problem that we face with the massive use of drugs, this very dangerous precedent, but it also has cost a lot of money, and it has been a cost to our civil liberties.

So in the name of the drug war, we have sacrificed much, both in terms of money and our liberties, while failing to solve our problem. The same could be said about the war on guns. The war

on guns only started recently. It is interesting to note that the war on guns and the war on drugs really got a tremendous boost in 1934. Prior to that, it was assumed by everybody in this country, under the Constitution, that deregulation of guns would be handled by the States. Yet endlessly we are writing laws and pursuing the gun rather than the criminal. In the same way, we are making very, very strong attempts to all the educational problems and medical problems, social problems and the environmental problems, all through regulations coming from Washington.

Now, you might say, well, that really is not a police function. We, all we do here in Congress is we write regulations. We are not authorizing guns to go and perform certain acts. But regulations have the force of law, and when you have the force of law, it is at least a threat of a government agent coming with a gun and threatening an individual either with a hefty fine or with imprisonment. So the rejection of the use of force also rejects the notion that you threaten to use force because the threat of force, if you have the power to do it, is just as sinister and just as dangerous as the force itself.

Mr. Speaker, many people in this country already concede that the concept of private property rights has just about been extinguished. And some would argue and say, how could that be. We all own our homes. We own our property. We own our farms and we own our ranches. But when they stop to think about it, they look at the tax burden we have. Now total taxes are about 50 percent, but when we pay our property taxes, we are merely paying rent to the Government. But the Federal Government is very much involved in this because they are writing regulations. And they have to go through numerous bureaus and agencies just to be able to use their own land, and frequently they are not allowed to use their own land.

So the concept of private property ownership has been seriously undermined in this country, and it continues to be further threatened by the radicals who believe that individuals should not have the right to use their land as they see fit.

The concept of liberty is indeed threatened. I believe there is less liberty in this country than there was 20, 30, 50 years ago. Certainly there is less liberty than was intended by the founders of this country. And as our liberties are diminished, we see the expanding role of the Federal Government, we see the expanding role of the bureaucrats who are now quite capable of carrying guns themselves.

But one of the symbols I think that comes from the Federal Government in their policing activities that dramatizes so well a serious problem that we face, that is that frequently on TV we see that we have these attacks or these confrontations with the citizens where the TV company is called out, the news

media is called out there to witness this wonderful event on how our government is enforcing the law. But very frequently, as I am sure so many of us here in the Congress have witnessed, is that our police force, whether it be the FBI or the BATF, they will wear a ski mask. Is it not interesting.

Mr. Speaker, why would they wear a ski mask in a free society to protect the people? I do not know the exact answer for that, but I would think that in a free society our policemen would be much more ready to show their badge, show their warrants and not wear ski masks. Our police are supposed to be our friends to protect us, not the kind that will break down and break into our houses with a mask on.

A lot of good intention goes into so much of our legislation here in the Congress, and yet I do not believe the good intentions themselves will be much good if we are using the wrong ideas. If we do not accept another notion about the role for government, if we do not accept the fact that economically we are facing bad times ahead because we literally cannot afford the welfare warfare state anymore, I think that conditions are going to get much worse because, as the people become frightened and concerned about their future, unfortunately there will still be a large number that will come here and lobby for more government rather than less, failing to realize that it was the size of government and the scope of government and the way we ran our monetary system that was the problem rather than the fact that we need more liberty, not more Congress, more congressional activity.

Today we have a bunch of laws on the books that permits and encourages the search and seizure and confiscation of property. We have 100 laws on the books today that allow confiscation of property without due process of law. Once the property is seized, it is up to the American citizen to prove that the property was seized incorrectly. Instead of honoring the constitutional commitment to innocent until proven guilty, it has been reversed as it is with the IRS. We are guilty until we prove ourselves innocent to the agencies who threaten our liberties.

□ 1445

Another trend that has occurred here in the last several years is disturbing to me. That is the willingness of our police agencies in the Federal Government to find the suspect rather quickly and then demonize the suspect in public.

The best recent example of course would be Richard Jewell, with the accusation that he ignited that bomb at the Olympics. Here is a man, hopefully he will get his redress in court, but it was still a perfect example of how our police officers took it to the media. That is no way for an American citizen to have their rights protected. Our goal and our obligation is to protect the rights, not to abuse and undermine the rights of our citizens.

What has all this done to us? Well, I think what it has done and has led to is that many Americans now are fearful, fearful of the Government. The Government is supposed to be our friend. We in the Government are supposed to be befriending the citizens and reaching out to them and taking care of their freedoms to make sure they are secure, secure that if they know they have a conflict, that we can settle the conflict in court, that we should be secure from outside threat.

Yet today many, many Americans feel very insecure. They feel insecure economically, they are not certain about what will happen in their economic future, but that is an economic issue. But what I am talking about here today, many of them feel insecure in their personal life. It is very intimidating to the average American if they receive a registered letter from the IRS, very, very intimidating, and it causes a great deal of anxiety. So obviously our tax system is a serious problem to all of us. But the people are not happy and they are not satisfied and they are very, very fearful of what is happening.

Now, some may write this off and say that the Congressman is just making this up because the American people are not fearful, everybody is very content and they are satisfied with the success of the welfare state and they are satisfied with the policing activities of all the agencies of government. But not too long ago, there was a poll done. The poll was very interesting. They wanted to find out how the American people felt about this very issue. They asked a rather strong question. They asked, do you feel like there is an immediate threat to your rights and freedoms from the Federal Government? The answers coming back to the Gallup Poll were slanted in one direction to such a degree that they could not even believe the results, so they went back and redid it, because they thought the people they were polling did not really understand what they were saying. So they were trying to get another answer. But the same answers came up again: 39 percent of our people feel immediate threat to their rights and to their freedoms by the Government. Maybe it is not true, but it is very important that they think that. I have seen other polls that were actually even worse than that, where people were fearful of the Government and are not satisfied with the way the Government operates.

The pollsters then decided they wanted to know, well, these must be all the right-wing extremists that are fearful of the Government and, therefore, we will just put them in a category and write them off, so they checked to find out whether these were liberals or conservatives that expressed this fear of the Government. It turned out that more liberals were fearful of the Government than the conservatives. This probably should not surprise us too much when you think of some of the

law enforcement that occurs and the abuse of civil liberties in our inner cities. It was just the other day I saw something in the New York Times that said that some teenagers were shot rather quickly, unarmed teenagers and then the questions were asked afterward. I realize how difficult a situation the police get into, but it still is well known that the abuse of police powers in the inner cities is there and something has to be done about it.

Senator Wallop when he left the Senate expressed some sincere interest in this particular subject and I believe is continuing to do some work in that area. He was shocked because so many of his constituents would come up and express their fear of the Government, whether they were the environmental people or whatever, but then they would quickly add after they told him about the problems they were facing, and the constituent would say to him, "Don't do anything. I don't want you to even rock the boat, because I'm fearful that they will come and get me."

That is a serious charge, and that comes from a respectable Senator who continues to work on this problem.

A couple of years ago, there was a group of individuals who banded together because they too were concerned about the growing police powers of the Federal Government, and they wrote to the President and they were expressing to him that he should do something about this, that the police powers of the Federal Government were indeed violating the civil liberties that we were acting in a perverse manner, we were not protecting liberty, we were destroying liberty.

I want to read from that particular letter that went to the President. He said he was urging the President to review the policies and practices of all Federal law enforcement agencies and to make recommendations and steps that must be taken to ensure that such agencies comply with the law. This review is necessitated by widespread abuses of civil liberties and human rights committed by these agencies and their failure to undertake meaningful and ameliorative reforms.

Federal police officers now comprise close to 10 percent of the Nation's total law enforcement force. Today some 53 separate Federal agencies have the authority to carry guns and make arrests. This represents an enormous expansion in recent years in terms of both personnel and jurisdiction. What is lacking, however, is a systematic oversight and review of Federal police practices.

Certainly we need oversight, but we also have to raise the question of whether this is the proper place to put the police. In the Constitution there are three Federal crimes listed. Today we have literally thousands. Nobody would know because we here in the Congress write the laws and the agencies write regulations that have the force of law.

They go on in this letter to point out some of the problems that they see.

Improper use of deadly force, physical and verbal abuse, use of paramilitary. That implies military law. Use of paramilitary and strike force units or tactics without justification. Use of no-knock entrances without justification. Inadequate investigation of allegations of misconduct; use of unreliable informants without sufficient verification of their allegations; use of contingency payments to informants, giving them an incentive to fabricate the information since payment is usually contingent on conviction; entrapment, unnecessary inducement of criminal activities as an investigative technique; inappropriate and disproportionate use of forfeiture proceedings to obtain financing for law enforcement equipment and activities; use of military units and equipment in the course of domestic law enforcement; pretential use of immigration laws and Immigration and Naturalization Service personnel for nonimmigration law enforcement.

Again, who is complaining to the President about this? Are these the rightwing extremists which is implied by so many in the media, a rightwing extremist attitude and idea that we have to curtail the Federal Government in their police powers? No; there are others who are interested in civil liberties as well. Let me just read a couple of names of the individuals who signed this letter to the President asking him to look into the matter. Ira Glasser, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union; Eric Sterling, president, the Criminal Justice Policy Foundation, Arnold Trebach, president, Drug Policy Foundation; James Grew, president, International Association for Civilian Oversight and Law Enforcement; John Hingson, president, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, not exactly a conservative group; Mary Broderick, director and defender, Division of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association.

So these are the people who are concerned about civil liberties. I think we all should be concerned about civil liberties. We certainly should, because we have the responsibility as we write law and as we perform oversight that our goal is to protect liberty, not write laws that end up undermining and demeaning the whole concept of liberty.

Just to use something more recent, the associate director of the American Civil Liberties Union has just written recently an editorial for Scripps-Howard, just a few months ago. In this letter, in this editorial, he says:

A powerful nation orders its telephone companies provided with foolproof wiretap access to the national communications infrastructure. The national police agency, which in recent years has been dramatically increasing the number of wiretaps, then demands the resources to tap one of every 100 telephone lines in the country's most populous area. The government claims it needs these new powers to combat domestic terrorism, but its own records show that only a microscopic portion of its wiretaps could have

anything to do with what might be called terrorist activity.

If it is not for terrorist activity, why do they need so many wiretaps? What is the purpose? He goes on to say, and in a way lectures us, he says:

This is precisely the sort of invasion of our privacy that during colonial times caused American patriots who had experienced general searches by the British to rebel and to adopt the protection of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. I think it would do us all well if we did look and read the Constitution and specifically in regards to this subject, the Fourth Amendment.

Again, this comes from not a rightwinger, but somebody from the American Civil Liberties Union, and we should not ignore that.

I would like to mention a few of the more startling cases that have occurred over the last 4 or 5 years. Some are well-known, some are less well-known, making the point that we do have specific examples of how our Government has overstepped its bounds.

One of the cases, and this first case I am going to talk about is fairly well-known. I think a lot of people and a lot of Members will have heard of it, but I just want to bring it up once again so that we do not forget because the problem has not been solved.

The first case occurred in 1992, and it involved a gentleman by the name of Don Carlson from San Diego. The DEA and the U.S. Custom agents raided his home. The claim was, the suspicion was, that it was a vacant drug storehouse. He arrived at home at 10:30 p.m. and the house was under surveillance at that time, and he walked in. If they were to issue a warrant, he was available. But he went to bed and after midnight the agents broke through the door, and he immediately thought he was being robbed. He reached for a legal firearm to defend himself, he did not fire a shot, he was shot three times, including once in the back, after he had been disarmed.

Now he did not die. He survived. He is disabled, but he has a lifetime of medical expenses as well as being disabled. No drugs or illegal weapons were found. The paid informant that gave this information had never specified which house to break into. So that is a shortcoming on the police activities of those individuals that went in.

Another case, 1991, Sina Brush, from New Mexico: 60 agents from the ATF, DEA, National Guard and the Forest Service charged that this Sina Brush possessed illegal drugs. They broke in, tore the place up, no drugs were ever found, but Mrs. Brush and her daughter who were not dressed, only partially dressed, were forced to kneel in the middle of the room during this whole episode while being handcuffed, and this all came about because of unreliable sources accusing them of being involved in the drug trade.

Another case, and this case is pretty well-known and that has to do with Donald Scott from the ranch in the Santa Monica Mountains. This was in

1992 as well. This occurred in the middle of the night. Why do they have to go in the middle of the night? This is a terrible thing for a free country to have police agents going in the middle of the night. You never hear of the same individuals going in the middle of the night into the inner city, but outside the city they are more likely to go in the middle of the night. This involved the DEA and some local police activity, and they were of course looking for drugs. The wife started screaming, and Scott grabbed a weapon because he did not even know who was coming into his house. He was quickly shot and killed.

□ 1500

No drugs were found, no illegal weapons were found in this house, and yet a man lost his life not at the expense of a burglar, but at the expense of his careless attitude about our policing activities that we have allowed to occur here in the U.S. Congress.

Another case: Louis Katona from Bucyrus, OH, a part-time police officer, had a run-in with the Federal police. He was a gun collector, and the BATF raided his house because it was said that he might have an illegal weapon.

As a matter of fact, the charge that was—that he was alleged to have committed was that he counterfeited, that he actually forged a document and signed it for the police chief. But after the dust settled they found out that he done everything properly, took the forms to the police chief and the police chief's AA, the administrative assistant, signed the bill, signed the document, and yet they went in and tore up his place with the idea of trying to find this illegal weapon.

Finally—at least finally all charges were dropped, but that is at a tremendous cost. And there was an additional problem there too because Mrs. Katona was pregnant at the time, and she was roughed up in the episode, that very night started to bleed and then subsequently had a miscarriage, and it very well could have been related, and most likely was.

I recall a personal case that occurred while I was practicing ob/gyn back in my home district, and my patient and my patient's husband appeared on the scene at a dock. They were getting off their boat. The husband went down first. He walked accidentally into a drug bust. He was quickly apprehended, thrown down on the deck, handcuffs put behind him, and he was merely standing by. He just happened to be a passerby.

When his wife spotted this, she rapidly ran down, and she was approximately 6 months pregnant, and she said, "What are you doing to my husband?" And they quickly did the same thing to her, slapped her down, put handcuffs on her back, her hands on her back, and put her on her stomach. Now fortunately she did not miscarry, but it could very well have caused a miscarriage, and yet it was all done in

the name of solving this drug problem which continuously gets much worse.

Harry Lamplough, a gun collector from Wellsboro, PA, had a run-in as well with our national police. There were 15 to 20 ATF agents that went into his house, and these agents all wore masks in the middle of the night. Lamplough, his wife and his attorney, who at one time was an ATF Assistant Director, verified the story that was told afterward.

And the agents came in, and they were looking for a particular gun. But in the meantime they took all his business records, they took all his mailing lists, they took his personal records, his birth certificate, his marriage certificate, baptismal records, mortgage records, and medical records. Lamplough was a cancer patient. They took his medication and strewed it on the floor, spread it all over the house and was a great deal of problems to him. And then, to add insult to injury, one of the agents stepped on their cat. But that was not enough. He picked it up and threw it at a tree and killed the cat.

During the whole time it was verified that very, very abusive language was used. Mrs. Lamplough was threatened that if she did not inform on her husband, that she would be thrown in prison under the worst of circumstances.

These things should not happen in America, we should not permit them to happen, and hopefully they are not happening as often, but I am not totally convinced of that.

Another case, Paul and Patty Mueller of St. Louis, in 1996, a more recent case. The ATF came in, a dozen men, kicked the door down. They never knock on the door and ask. They kick the doors down. Even if they have a key, they kick the door down. They threatened to kill the dog. Mr. Mueller had his hands bound, he was pushed to the floor at gun point, and they kept yelling and screaming "ATF, ATF." These people were very innocent, and they had no idea who they were or what was happening, and they were fearful for their lives. They thought they were being wrong.

It was an hour later that the ATF officers presented a search warrant. No weapons were found, no drugs were found, but a paid informant gave the information which turned out to be wrong. There were no apologies and no payment for the damages.

There was a case up in—another case in Pennsylvania. James Corcoran, a police officer, had been arrested on a gun charge, and when it finally got to court, it came out in testimony and it was admitted by the BATF that they tampered with the weapon and made it into an automatic weapon in order to convict him of a crime. Fortunately, that case was cleared up because they were able to get the BATF to admit this.

Another case, Gilberto and Josefine Gomez, a couple years ago, Mexican citizens. They came to the United

States. They were legal immigrants. They had—Gilberto had an accident, and he won in a suit, compensation suit, he won \$19,000, and he was taking it back to Mexico in cash because he was not sophisticated enough to have a checking account nor do wire services or do any of that, and he had proof of it. He carried proof of where the money came from.

But when he got to the border he was arrested, the money was taken from him, and then when it was realized that this looked like legitimate honest money, they made an offer to him. They wanted him to settle out of court, and they say, we will give you back \$13,000 if we can keep \$6,000. That was the bargain they offered him. He refused that. I do not know for sure if that was totally settled and he got all his money back, but for the most part once the property is confiscated, once the money or property is taken by the Government, which is not by due process of the law, it is very, very difficult to get these funds back.

Just recently this past week there was an article in the Wall Street Journal that dramatizes a case that adds to this sentiment of the people, why they are not happy with the Federal Government, they are not happy with us here in the Congress because they see stories like this. But not only do they read about these stories, they know about these stories. You hear them endlessly if we just will listen to our constituents.

In March of—well, this was a story about James J. Wilson. He was a developer in Maryland, nearby here, and he is actually an American success story. He started a construction company in 1957 with nothing. He had \$760, and now he has been charged with a very, very vicious crime, and he was charged with filling a wetlands with water. I mean that is serious, and unfortunately for him, he has a long way to go to win, but he is a fighter and let us hope he does win.

In his trial, which occurred just recently, he had some environmental experts testify in favor of him and say there has been absolutely no negative environmental impact on what he was doing in his development. When he started his development in Maryland, he went to the Corps of Engineers, and he got approval, and they said that there were no hazards, and he was given the approval to proceed. But in the middle of his development they came by and they reassessed it. I guess they came by right after it rained, and they saw a damp spot, and they said "Ah, ha, you have wetlands on your land. You will stop, stop the development." He did. He never once violated a cease and desist order.

But he was not very happy. He was losing a lot of money. It was something that he had been given original approval for, they changed the rules, and now they were accusing him of this vicious crime, and he was upset, so he filed suit. He had not talked to the

Senator who was told by his constituents: Do not do anything, it is dangerous if you do anything. But he did not have that advice, so he went, he filed suit against the Federal Government.

And what happened? His noncriminal charges turned into criminal charges for what he had done.

Now this is interesting. It is said that he has violated the Clean Water Act of 1972. If you go back and read the Clean Water Act of 1972, it talks very clearly about not discharging any pollutant into a navigable water. That is basically what the Clean Water Act was about in 1972. But with regulations and with court rulings this has evolved into a monstrous piece of legislation which has encouraged the Wall Street Journal in their article to talk about the wetlands gestapo. And this is not just from some fringe newspaper. They are talking about a Federal Government agent running a gestapo-type agency.

And the case has pursued; he has lost one case, but it is still, hopefully, something he can win. But the Government is saying that they have the right and the authority to regulate this. Their constitutional argument is that at one time somebody knows of some beavers on that land, have not been caught and transferred over the State line. Now if that is not the most gross distortion of the interstate commerce clause I have heard, I do not know what it could be. The interstate commerce clause by our Founders was written for the purpose not to regulate interstate commerce, which was done throughout the 20th century, but it was written precisely to break down the barriers between the States, and it is doing exactly the opposite right now.

Now where Mr. Wilson deserves a lot of credit is the fact that he is not arguing this on a technicality. He is arguing this on a constitutional issue, that they do not have the right, the Federal Government does not have the right, to come in and regulate and harass as they have done.

The tragedy, of course, is that he has gone through his first trial, he is fighting on principle, he spent \$5.7 million on legal fees, he lost, he got fined personally \$1 million, his company was fined \$3 million, and he is sentenced to 21 years in jail for being an American dream story, going from nothing, building, being a developer, doing his very best to follow the rules, providing jobs. We are going to put him in prison; that is what we are doing today.

No wonder people who are really ambitious are so often encouraged to take their businesses elsewhere. Whether it is labor law regulations, environmental regulations, or health regulations, they are just too burdensome for so many of our business people that it is so much easier to just take the business overseas, and this is a good example of why we encourage so many of our jobs to leave our country.

Big question here is: Do we in the Congress think Government is too big?

I think the American people think our Government is too big and it is too abusive. And in a personal way it is too intrusive in our personal lives, whether we are wiretapping too many telephones or whether we are stopping too many people and taking their money and assuming they are convicts and criminals even without any due process of law and without probable cause. The big question is: Is this out of control? Is it reversible? That is the question we have to ask. I hope it is reversible; that is one of the reasons why I came here to Washington, because I would like to reverse some of this. It needs to be reversed because if we continue in this same direction, we are all going to suffer.

We must do something about this. This country is a great country, but we have to know what it was that made it great. We have to understand the principles of liberty. We have to understand why individual liberty precludes redistribution of wealth, protecting our rights, protecting our civil liberties, providing for a national defense, and not to micromanage every piece of property and threaten people with jail and have our doors broken down with a police, Federal police that wear masks. We have to really think seriously about this and do our very best to change it.

I understand there are some moves in the Congress to bring about a more sensible approach on the seizure of property and the forfeiture, and, hopefully, that will do some good.

□ 1615

I do not think a lot will be accomplished unless we address the overriding subject of what the role of Government ought to be. Unless we decide we want a government that protects liberty, and that we have respect for our Constitution and the rule of law, I do not believe that we will get rid of the Federal police force very easily.

The agents that we see performing these acts that I am complaining about, Mr. Speaker, in some way I am critical of it, and every one of us has personal responsibility in obeying orders. Wartime is never an excuse.

But in many ways, I have a lot of sympathy for the agents. I do not place a lot of blame on the individual agents, because for the most part, I will bet if we looked at all the BATF officers and all the FBI officers, I believe they are very honest, decent American citizens, believing in their hearts that they are doing the right thing, that they are following and enforcing the law. We all know that in a civil society we have to have law and we have to have law enforcement. They probably feel very good about what they do.

I do think there has to be a limit. Certainly if we are using war gases and participating in raging fires that burn up little children, I think we should question it. I think if we are—as individuals, if the policeman is asked to shoot somebody in the back or he ends

up shooting somebody in the back, or shooting an unarmed mother holding a baby, yes, there is some personal responsibility there.

But I am also convinced that the overwhelming number of individuals that work for all our agencies in Government are probably very decent American citizens trying to do their very best to obey the law and do a good job.

The agencies of Government bear some responsibility; not the agents, but the agencies. Policy is very important. The agencies we create, the administration in power, has a lot to do with policy, but policy is very, very important. So the administrator that we have of that policy, the current President, has a great deal of responsibility in how these laws and the enforcement of the laws are carried out. They bear some responsibility.

Then again, there is another group. There is another group that has a lot of responsibility, and now that is hitting closer to home. Ultimately these agents, these agencies, and this policy comes from here. It comes from the U.S. Congress.

The BATF officers and the FBI are not vigilantes. They get their authority and they get their funds from us. So if we do not like what they are doing, and I do not, I do not go and complain bitterly about the agent himself because he has an infraction, or something did not work as well as he thought. That is not the problem.

The problem here is that policy being carried out by the administration has originated here in the House and in the Senate, and we provide the funding. So if we create these agencies and allow them to happen, then the responsibility falls on us.

Ultimately, the responsibility falls on the people, because we should be a reflection of the people. So when the people object enough, maybe the Members of Congress will do something about it. But I just want to make that point one more time; it is not the individual agent who creates the problem, it is the policy. It is the philosophy of Government. It is we here in the Congress who pursue and permit these things to occur.

What will the solution be if we decide that we have overstepped our bounds? Of course, we can start repealing, we can start doing more oversight, we can start putting more rules and regulations to restrain; but overall, the real solution comes from us upholding here in the Congress our oath of office, which should be the rule of law; that is to obey the Constitution.

The Constitution does not authorize so much of what is going on. It just is not there. If we take our oath of office seriously, we will not continue to finance these agencies of Government. We here in the Congress create the agencies. The agencies are permitted then to write the regulations. The regulations themselves have the power of law.

Then we permit the agencies to become the Justice Department as well. They can be judge and jury. They do not go into civil court, they go into the administrative courts. This is part of our problem. Not only do we give them the power of the administration, we give them the power of the judiciary. We give these agencies the police powers as well. So we have created a dictatorship within our system when we create these agencies of Government.

All rules, all agency regulations, should be approved by the U.S. Congress, and we should do something to curtail the power and the authority of these agencies through limiting of their funds.

It is not difficult, Mr. Speaker, on what to do. The answers are written very clearly in the document we have sworn to uphold. If we read and obey the Constitution, the solutions will come to us. We must work for a moral and just society. We must reject the notion of violence. We should never condone the idea that the Government is there to force people to act in certain manners. And if we do this, I am totally convinced that we will have a much freer and more prosperous society.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. STRICKLAND (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. STABENOW (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending the funeral of the former Speaker of the New York State Assembly, Stanley Fink.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAPPAS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COOK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PITTS, for 5 minutes, on March 12.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYUN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CANNON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Illinois) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. HILLIARD.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. MARKEY.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAPPAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

Mr. BARR in two instances.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. NETHERCUTT.

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. JONES.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. CALLAHAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JONES.

Mr. SUNUNU.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. GILMAN.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.

Mr. SOLOMON.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 10, 1997, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2113. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Tennessee [Docket No. 97-009-1] received March 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2114. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Poultry Inspection: Revision of Finished Product Standards With Respect to Fecal Contamination [Docket No. 94-016F] (RIN: 0583-AC25) received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2115. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act—Air Force violation, case No. 95-14, which totaled \$958,239, occurred when personnel obligated fiscal year 1993 operation and maintenance, Air Force (O&M, AF) funds for work that was not needed until fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2116. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increased Allowances for the Educational Assistance Test Program (RIN: 2900-A153) received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

2117. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Restrictions on Advances to Non-Qualified Thrift Lenders [No. 97-12] received February 27, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2118. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Oregon Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes: Oregon [OR64-7279a, OR36-1-6298a, OR46-1-6802a; FRL-5696-8] received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2119. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Oregon [OR59-7274, OR60-7275; FRL-5696-6] received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2120. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Approval of Source-Specific RACT [PA069-4040, PA078-4041, PA083-4043; FRL-5698-7] received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2121. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department [AR 059-0005a; FRL-5697-3] received March 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2122. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Brunei (Transmittal No. DTC-46-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2123. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC-51-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2124. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with the United Arab Emirates [UAE] (Transmittal No. DTC-14-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on international agreements transmitted to Congress after the deadline for their submission, with reasons, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2126. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's certification that the Republic of Armenia, the Azerbaijani Republic, the Republic of Georgia, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and the Republic of Uzbekistan are committed to the courses of action described in section 1203(d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (title XII of Public Law 103-160), section 1412(d) of the Former Soviet Union Demilitarization Act of 1992 (title XIV of Public Law 102-484), and section 502 of the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102-511); to the Committee on International Relations.

2127. A letter from the Executive Director, Assassination Records Review Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2128. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Management) and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2129. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2130. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2131. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2132. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2133. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2134. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report

on nuclear reactor safety in Ukraine and Russia; jointly, to the Committees on National Security and International Relations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TALENT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 852. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies (Rept. 105-7, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. HORN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 963. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on any basis other than factors pertaining to job performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Government Reform and Oversight, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURR of North Carolina:

H.R. 964. A bill to authorize the marketing of breast self-examination pads without restriction; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 965. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COMBEST (for himself and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 966. A bill to provide reimbursement under the Medicare Program for telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 967. A bill to prohibit the use of United States funds to provide for the participation of certain Chinese officials in inter-

national conferences, programs, and activities and to provide that certain Chinese officials shall be ineligible to receive visas and be excluded from admission to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHRLICH (for himself, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. MINGE):

H.R. 968. A bill to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to permit a waiver of the prohibition of offering nurse aide training and competency evaluation programs in certain nursing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 969. A bill to establish sources of funding for the certain transportation infrastructure projects in the vicinity of the border between the United States and Mexico that are necessary to accommodate increased traffic resulting from the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, including construction of new Federal border crossing facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WISE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BONO, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 970. A bill to encourage the increased use of domestic natural gas as a transportation fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, National Security, Ways and Means, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LAZIO of New York):

H.R. 971. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Northern Forest Lands Council; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 972. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to eliminate the market access program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 973. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to administer a program of construction and revitalization of public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 974. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restore the Department of Defense loan guarantee program for small and medium-sized business concerns that are economically dependent on defense expenditures; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. McKEON, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 975. A bill to remove a restriction on the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies to acquire goods and services directly related to improving or utilizing firefighting capability of the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 976. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 977. A bill to provide for the conversion of existing temporary U.S. district judgeships to permanent status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KLING, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SABO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OBEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BONO, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 978. A bill to assess the impact of NAFTA, to require the renegotiation of certain provisions of NAFTA, and to provide for the withdrawal from NAFTA unless certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LAZIO of New York):

H.R. 979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of private activity which may be issued in each State, and to index such amount for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (for himself, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MICA, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 980. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to protect the speech and association rights of students attending institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 981. A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor

vehicles by intoxicated individuals; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 982. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, provide for a national minimum sentence for a person who operates a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 983. A bill to amend certain Federal civil rights statutes to prevent the involuntary application of arbitration to claims that arise from unlawful employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCRERY:

H.R. 984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to individual investment accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 985. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness within Arapaho and White River National Forests, CO, to include the lands known as the Slate Creek Addition upon the acquisition of the lands by the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 986. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, to establish certain limitations relating to the use of official time by Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. EWING, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SNOWBARGER):

H.R. 987. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for continuing appropriations in the absence of the regular appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FROST, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KLUG, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FOGLETTA, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit for a portion of the expenses of providing dependent care services to employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUINN:

H.R. 989. A bill to prohibit the distribution or receipt of restricted explosives without a Federal permit, and to require applications for such permits to include a photograph and the fingerprints of the applicant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. McHALE, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.R. 990. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide for the development and use of brownfields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 991. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act concerning the applicability of requirements of that act to U.S. air carriers and flight deck crews engaged in flight operations outside the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 992. A bill to end the Tucker Act shuffle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. JONES, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. EWING, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado):

H.R. 993. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to repeal the National Service Trust Program under which certain persons who perform national or community service receive stipends and educational awards for such service; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 994. A bill to designate the U.S. border station located in Pharr, TX, as the "Kika de la Garza United States Border Station"; to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that fees for Internet and other online services are not, and shall not be, subject to tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 996. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to finance environmental remediation of contaminated sites; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow expensing and rapid amortization of certain environmental remediation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAHAN (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person born in the United States will be a U.S. citizen on account of birth in the United States unless a parent is a U.S. citizen at the time of the birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the meaning of the second amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. YATES, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OLVER):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution supporting the commitments of the United States announced at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, held in Beijing, China, in September 1995; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution expressing the commitment of the Congress to continue the leadership of the United States in the United Nations by honoring the financial obligations of the United States to the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCNULTY,

Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. QUINN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. BONIOR):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a postage stamp should be issued to honor law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. WISE:

H. Res. 84. Resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 85. Resolution electing members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 86. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 998. A bill for the relief of Lloyd B. Gamble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 999. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for a hopper barge; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1: Mr. PAUL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BLILEY, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 15: Mr. BACHUS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BERRY, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 26: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 58: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 66: Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 76: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 96: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 100: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 145: Ms. DANNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 192: Mr. PARKER and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 216: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr.

POMEROY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. QUINN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 279: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KLING, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 339: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 342: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 343: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 350: Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FROST, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 407: Ms. FURSE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 411: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 414: Mr. PARKER and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 426: Mr. RYUN and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 445: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 446: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 450: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 471: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 548: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YATES, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 551: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 552: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 577: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 586: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 598: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 600: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 616: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 628: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 640: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 644: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 659: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 680: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 683: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 684: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 753: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 767: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 768: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 775: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.

H.R. 786: Mr. ROGERS and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 793: Mr. YATES, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 804: Ms. JACKSON-LEE and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 813: Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 814: Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. YATES, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 832: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 845: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 852: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. EWING, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr.

LOBIONDO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYUN, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 911: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 919: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 922: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 923: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 934: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 954: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. LARGENT.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. SHAW, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SNOWBARGER, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. KLINK, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 30: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 48: Mr. HAYWORTH.

# DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 811: Mr. BARR of Georgia.